The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXVI, No. 2 FEBRUARY, 1947

CONTENTS

When is a Strike Lawful? . *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 81

The Assumption in Liturgy . . *William J. Lallou* 93

St. Jerome: His Life and Literary Work *Frederick L. Moriarty, S.J.* 100

Paratrooper Padre: Part IV . . *Francis Sampson* 109

Six-Thirty . . . . . *Leo J. Trese* 124

The Spirituality of the Diocesan Priesthood *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 126

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

"Interfaith" Problems 141

Surgery for the Healthy 143

Coalescence of Thefts through Intention 145

The Double Ring Ceremony Again 146

The Investiture of a Domestic Prelate 146

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States, $4.00; Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1947, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

White Gold for Sacred Vessels 148
Intoning the *Pange Lingua* at Processions 148
How the Acolytes should hold their Candles . . . 149
Suppression of the Use of Saliva in Adult Baptism . . 149
Sponsors at Baptism 150

ANALECTA 152

BOOK REVIEWS
Dante Alighieri, *by Gerald G. Walsh, S.J.* 154
The Mysteries of Christianity, *by M. J. Scheeben* . . 154
Light from the Ancient Past, *by Jack Finegan* . . . 157
Mission for Samaritans, *by Anna Dengel, M.D.* . . . 158

BOOK NOTES 159

TIMELY FOR
LENT *and* HOLY WEEK

Theology for the Mind and the Heart

The Atonement of Christ is
God's Method of our
At-one-ment with Him

GOD'S OWN METHOD
By Aloysius McDonough, CP., STD.
with Preface by
Archbishop Cushing of Boston

"An Ought-to-be Best Seller"
—*Thinker's Digest*

READY FEBRUARY 15th
$2.00
(Postage prepaid on prepaid orders)

Order from your Catholic Bookmart
or
The Sign Press, Monastery Place,
Union City, N. J.

For the Sacristy and the Sanctuary
Manual of
Forty Hours' Adoration

This Manual Contains LITANIAE ET PRECES: the Approved Music for "Te Deum" and "Tantum Ergo," and everything requisite for the Devotion—Ceremonies, Rubrics and Prayers.

Order copies now, so that they will be on hand when needed, as they are sure to be.

Twenty-five cents per copy.
Five copies, one dollar

The Catholic University of America Press
620 Michigan Avenue, N. E.
Washington 17, D. C.

WHEN IS A STRIKE LAWFUL?

That an employee is morally justified in going on a strike against his employer, certain conditions being presupposed, is an ethical doctrine that no Catholic could deny. Pope Leo XIII, in his epoch-making *Rerum novarum*, asserted: "Labor which is too long and too hard and the belief that pay is inadequate not infrequently give workers cause to strike and become voluntarily idle."[1] Although the Pope does not say explicitly that the workers have a *justifiable* cause for striking in the conditions he describes, this is undoubtedly implied, inasfar as he lays no blame on the strikers but declares that public authority should remedy the situation by removing the causes.

Catholic theologians of our times are at one in teaching that a strike can be lawful. Their argument is based on the analogy with man's right to defend himself against unjust aggression, *cum moderamine inculpatae tutelae;* for the oppression of the worker by his employer is certainly unjust aggression.[2] The basic Christian principle from which the right to strike is logically deduced is that which asserts that every human being, however lowly his condition and menial his tasks, possesses a personal dignity which entitles him to just and humane treatment from all his fellowmen, including anyone to whom he may have contracted for a certain amount of service.

We must not imagine, however, that the strike was always regarded as a legitimate means for labor to protect itself against capital. Until comparatively recent times there was a tendency to classify the walk-out of an organized group of workers as a form of rebellion or treason, deserving of a grave penalty. In the year 1400 a group of two thousand weavers who had gone out on strike in Cologne were exiled from the city *en masse*, with the exception of thirty ringleaders, who were hanged.[3] Until the closing decade of the nineteenth century, theologians gave little attention to the moral aspect of the strike, and when they did treat of it, they were inclined to pass a severe judgment on those

[1] *Rerum novarum*, in *Acta Leonis XIII* (Rome, 1894), IV, 197; *Principles of Peace* (N.C.W.C., Washington, D.C., 1943), n. 152.

[2] Cf. Merkelbach, *Summa theologiae moralis* (Paris, 1938), II, n. 556.

[3] Cf. Cavallera, *Précis de la doctrine sociale catholique* (Paris, 1933), p. 237.

who participated in this form of protest. Konings, writing in 1874, exhibits very little sympathy for those who go on strike (a measure which he says is used particularly by the members of the *Internationale*), and makes no effort to present the conditions required to justify a strike. He merely states that the principles relative to the morality of a monopoly are applicable to the strike.[4] In the first edition of Sabetti's *Compendium theologiae moralis*, which appeared in 1884, the strike is not mentioned. In the 1880 edition of Scavini's *Theologia moralis universa* we are told that societies of workingmen have deteriorated into occasions of sin, and in illustrating this statement the author classifies the inducing of strikes in the same category as irreligion.[5] The severe judgment of the theological school of those days was due in great measure to the indubitable fact that many strikes were inspired by the Socialist movement. Moreover, the *Rerum novarum* had not yet appeared, to give the Catholic world in definite and detailed form the full Christian concept of the rights of the worker. Since this masterpiece of Leo XIII was promulgated, theologians have not failed to defend, adequately and equitably, the right to strike.

However, like other human rights, the right to strike must be qualified. No Catholic theologian or sociologist would hold that a group of workingmen may at any time and for any reason walk out on their employer. Organized labor has obligations, both in justice and in charity, toward capital, and particularly toward society. In recent times labor unions have attained to a position of great influence in our country, and for that reason it is incument on Catholics to be familiar with the teachings of Catholic theology regarding the lawfulness of the strike according to the principles of the divine law. For, whatever benefits the right to strike may be able to confer on the workingman, it can cause immeasurable harm, extending even to the destruction of a nation, unless it is restrained and directed by Christian social principles. It is the purpose of this article to propound and to explain those principles as they apply to the right to strike.

It must be premised that when we refer to a strike we are not concerned with the cessation from work of a single individual or

[4] Konings, *Theologia moralis* (Boston, 1874), n. 1012.

[5] Scavini, *Theologia moralis universa* (Milan, 1880), I, n. 273.

of a few individuals. The moral principles that govern such a procedure are, indeed, substantially the same as those which are to be explained below. Nevertheless, since a walkout on so small a scale ordinarily causes no great harm to society, it would not call for the careful comparing of anticipated good and evil effects which should be undertaken before a strike such as we are referring to can be lawfully inaugurated. When we speak of a strike we mean that type of industrial weapon which can be defined as *the cessation from work of a large organized group of workers by common agreement for the purpose of obtaining from their employers certain advantages.* It should be added, too, that the intention of the workers is to return to their job when they have obtained their objective—not to sever connections with their employers definitively. Finally, under present day conditions at least, a strike normally includes some manner of persuasion to others not to take the jobs abandoned by the strikers.

The principle from which Catholic moralists derive the conditions required to justify a group of strikers is that a strike is a kind of war—an economic war, with employees and employers as the opposing forces.[6] Accordingly, generally speaking, the same conditions that are necessary to render a war between nations just must be fulfilled in order that a group of workers may lawfully go on strike. These conditions can be presented under three headings:–

(1) *There must be a just reason for declaring the strike.* We can distinguish two types of strike—defensive and ameliorative. The former is one that takes place when the workers are being subjected to conditions that are truly unjust, particularly when the employer has not lived up to the terms of his contract in the matter of wages, working-hours, etc. And since the opinion that the worker is entitled in commutative justice to a *family wage* is undoubtedly the more probable Catholic view,[7] the fact that an employer (able to do so) does not pay such a wage constitutes a sufficient reason for a strike, unless the employees contracted for a smaller sum. But, even in this supposition, a strike would be justified if some form of coercion had been employed to induce them to accept the contract—for example, if the employer took

[6] Cf. Prümmer, *Manuale theologiae moralis* (Friburg Brisg., 1936), II, n. 309.

[7] Cf. Aertnys-Damen, *Theologia moralis* (Turin, 1944), I, n. 559.

advantage of the fact that they could not get another job to force them to accept his excessively low offer. It should be noted, too, that if the value of money has become considerably less with the change of economic conditions, a contract which stipulated a wage amount that was just at the time the contract was made, but with the depreciation of the value of money is no longer a family living wage, can be regarded as no longer binding in conscience on the worker.[8]

Catholic theologians nowadays unanimously admit the lawfulness of a defensive strike, at least as far as a sufficient reason for the strike is concerned—granting, of course, that injustice is actually being done to the workers. As far as an ameliorative strike is concerned—that is, a strike directed to obtaining better conditions, even though those actually existing are not unjust—it is evident that it is not permissible, if it involves the violation of a just contract. But even when there is no injustice on the part of employees in starting an ameliorative strike, there may be a violation of charity toward the employer and the general public, depending on the proportion between the good expected and the harm that will be wrought. Indeed, there have been theologians who taught that an ameliorative strike is intrinsically wrong;[9] and although this view is no longer held, it serves as a proof of the reluctance of theologians to give unqualified approval to a procedure that is frequently fraught with transgressions of justice or of charity.

A group of workers cannot be said to have a just reason for striking unless they have first made every reasonable attempt to settle their differences by peaceful measures. This is analogous to one of the conditions required to justify a nation in entering a war. However unfair may be an employer's treatment of his employees, they must first seek redress by arbitration, unless it is evident that their endeavors will be futile. For a strike, like a war, is an evil, and as such must be avoided if this is at all possible. "Nothing but the strictest demands of justice for the employees can justify so drastic an action as that of the strike. It

[8] Nowadays there is generally a clause in the wage contract of union workers permitting either party to reopen negotiations on demand, after the lapse of a brief period. This would automatically provide for the abrogation of a contract that has become unjust because of the depreciation of the value of money.

[9] Cf. Prümmer, *op. cit.*, II., n. 309.

must at all times be the last and only resort after every other practical and peaceful means has been employed to solve the differences between employer and employed."[10] Moreover, when the government offers (even though it does not command) the use of a "fact-finding board," the workingmen are bound to accept the offer, in the hope that the publication of the findings will inspire enough public sympathy to secure the triumph of justice. Although the latter plan necessarily involves a period of delay before the strike may be called, the hardship thus imposed on the would-be strikers is so little compared to the dire results of a strike that they would be transgressing the moral law if they refused to try it.

(2) *The benefits anticipated or hoped for from the strike must be sufficiently great to compensate for the evils which it is likely to produce.* This, too, is an application to economic conflict of a condition required by all theologians to justify a nation's entrance into war. And the evils which the workers are bound to take into consideration in making their judgment on this matter are not merely those which they themselves may encounter. It stands to reason that they will not go on strike unless they have good reason to hope that, in the long run, their gains will surpass their losses. But they must also look to the welfare of others—their employers and the public. They may not inflict financial harm on those who own the shop or factory—and still less, on the great body of their fellow-citizens—to an extent far out of proportion to the advantages they have set as their goal, even though their demands are just and reasonable. The virtue of social justice is incumbent on labor as well as on capital; the worker may not trample roughshod over his fellowmen in his endeavors to improve his economic status.

This point is supremely important today, when some labor leaders, possessing well-nigh dictatorial powers over the members of their union, seem to have no concern for the harm that will come to the public from a strike. Indeed, many of the strikes that have vexed our land in recent months seem to be directed against the public rather than against the employers, apparently to the end that when the people are deprived of some necessary commodity they will try to persuade the employers to yield to

[10] Smith, *Spotlight on Labor Unions* (New York, 1946), p. 53.

their workers' demands. Such a procedure is analogous to the direct bombing of non-combatants in warfare, in the hope that they will induce their government to surrender—and is just as immoral. To be legitimate, according to Catholic principles, a strike must be directed at the employers, in such wise that any injury done to the public welfare must be only incidental, and in addition must not be so extensive as to outweigh considerably whatever benefits the strikers are striving to obtain.

Extraordinarily grave reasons are needed to justify a strike on the part of a group of workers whose particular employment renders the public dependent on them for some of the principal needs of life—for example, those who work on railroads or in power plants or coal mines. We have recently witnessed the crippling effects on the entire nation when workers of such categories go on strike. It is hard to justify some of the strikes that have taken place in recent months, for we cannot say that the workers were in extreme necessity, and the advantages they attained—or hoped to attain—expressed in terms of money were but a very small proportion of the losses they inflicted on the American people, and even on the destitute in Europe. Commendable as our sympathy for the workingman may be, we cannot forget that he has serious obligations in his use of the powerful weapon that is available to him in the organized strike; and if he abuses his power, Catholic principles do not uphold him. How strikingly have the words of Pope Leo XIII, written more than a half century ago, been verified in our own days: "Such interruption of work inflicts damage not only upon employers and upon the workers themselves, but also injures trade and commerce and the general interests of the State, and since it is usually not far removed from violence and rioting, it very frequently jeopardizes public peace."[11]

(3) *The means employed by the strikers must be morally good.* Here, again, we have a condition analogous to one that is required to render just the waging of war. As soldiers must restrict their acts of hostility to the rules laid down by the natural and the international law, so strikers in conducting their strike must confine themselves to what is permitted by natural and civil law.

[11] *Rerum novarum*, in *Acta Leonis XIII*, IV, 197; *Principles of Peace* (N.C.W.C., Washington, D.C., 1943), n. 152.

It is not easy to define in full detail what is allowed and what is forbidden in this matter. Certainly, physical violence against the employers and destruction of their property are prohibited; on the other hand, peaceful picketing is certainly lawful. But it is difficult to state how far force can be employed against strike-breakers—"scabs," as they are called. Presuming that the employees are engaged in a just defensive strike, it would seem that sufficient physical violence to prevent these men from entering the shops or factories would be permissible, inasmuch as they are unjustly co-operating toward depriving the workers of the means of livelihood; but the use of violence for the direct purpose of injuring these men, destroying their homes or their cars, etc., would be sinful. However, even when violent methods are *per se* justifiable the danger of exceeding due limits is so great that in practice they are to be disapproved.[12]

What is to be said of the so-called "sit-down" strike, which had considerable vogue in our country a few years ago? This form of strike took place when the employees occupied the shop or factory and remained there night and day, thus effectively preventing any other workers from using the machinery. Some have written sympathetically of this type of strike, on the score that it is analogous to the act of self-defense whereby a person seizes the weapon with which another is preparing to injure him.[13] However, it is difficult to justify it on this principle, unless the workers are in extreme need, and this is the only way in which they can prevent the introducing of "scab" labor. Even in such circumstances, its use is not to be recommended, inasmuch as it almost always leads to vandalism.

In more recent times a procedure called the "slow-down strike" has sometimes been employed. This means that, while the workers do not quit their jobs, they work so slowly that production is greatly diminished. A form of this strike took place in New York several months ago, when drivers of one of the bus lines reduced the progress of their vehicles to a mere crawl. In considering the

[12] Cf. MacLean, *The Morality of the Strike* (New York, 1921), pp. 103 ff. Msgr. John A. Ryan wrote: "It is certain that the good effects to be obtained through the use of violence are practically never sufficient to outweigh the evil effects; for the benefits that labor would thus secure are insignificant compared with the social disorder and anarchy through which they would be obtained" ("Labor Unions," *Catholic Encyclopedia, VIII*, 725).

[13] Cf. *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, XCVII, 1 (July, 1937), 31 ff.

morality of such a strike, it must be remembered that the employees are receiving full pay for the slight amount of work they are doing, which means that they are not rendering service adequate to their salary. At most, this type of strike could be justified in the event that the workers have not been receiving a living wage, so that their present earnings could be considered compensation for past injustice. It could hardly be justified for an ameliorative objective.

The "sympathy strike" also offers moral problems. If the "sympathy strikers" are a group employed by the same firm as the original strikers, there would surely be occasions when such a strike would be justifiable. But when workers from other establishments, having no grievance of their own, join the first group, it is difficult to see how their action can ordinarily be squared with moral principles—apart (perhaps) from the case of a group of workers whose particular form of work is directly beneficial to the employers of the original strikers. Even this concession could hardly be made except when the matter at issue is very important. But when the purpose is merely to harass the public and clog industrial activity to such an extent that the demands of the original workers must be met, we have an example of an utterly immoral attack on society. This injustice is accentuated when the "sympathy strike" reaches the proportions of a "general strike"—when all workers in a locality quit their jobs to support the claims of a comparatively small number. Of this type of strike, even in the supposition that the original strikers have a just grievance, Msgr. MacLean remarks: "It would be most unreasonable to demand that the great body of employers and the general public be compelled to suffer such great hardships and injuries as such a strike would surely cause, in order that an offending employer may be coerced into reasonable treatment of a small section of the community. It would be a remedy out of all proportion to the cure."[14] While this article was being written, the papers announced a general strike in Oakland, Cal., the occasion being protection given by the police to some trucks driven by strike-breakers. The strike affected a million persons and cost about one million dollars a day during its brief progress. How can one find any proportion between the alleged wrong and the evils

[14] MacLean, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

brought about by the general strike, even though it be granted that the former could have been an opening wedge to discrimination against unionism?

These three conditions, then, must be fulfilled in order that the inauguration and the conducting of a strike may be in conformity with the law of God—that is, considering the matter from the standpoint of *objective* morality. Another condition is required for the *subjective* justification of the strike—a right intention. Just as a nation may not undertake to wage a war unless the purpose be the promotion of some good or the prevention of some evil, as distinct from the gratification of cruelty, ambition, etc.,[15] so the purpose of the strikers must be to obtain just and equitable wages, to eliminate unsanitary working conditions, and the like, rather than to give expression to class hatred or revenge. It would be advisable for priests who occupy posts of pastoral care or influence over workingmen to emphasize this requirement of the moral law, especially when rumors of a strike are brewing. Undoubtedly, there are union leaders today who are definitely fostering an attitude of antagonism toward capital—an attitude entirely contrary to the spirit of co-operation and friendliness which the Catholic Church wishes to promote between employers and employees.

One of the conditions set down by theologians as a requisite for a just war is that the inception of hostilities be proclaimed by the supreme authority of the state. "It does not pertain to a private person to start a war," says St. Thomas.[16] In this respect the analogy between a war and a strike fails, for it is the prerogative of an individual to quit work on his own authority (other conditions being presupposed) whereas men may wage war only as an organized society. However, in practice, at the present day, a strike is inaugurated only when the union votes for it. This suggests a point relevant to the membership of Catholics in labor unions—their obligation to take an active part in the deliberation and voting. If the administration of the union is left to a small minority, it is quite easy for a radical group to become the dominant factor of the organization and to direct it according to false principles. The same situation begets labor leaders with power little less than that of dictators. The admonition of Fr. Smith is

[15] Cf. St. Thomas, *Sum. theol.*, II-II, q. 40, a. 1. [16] *Ibid.*

timely: "Labor leaders have no right to call a strike for any other reason than one that intimately concerns the welfare of the workers involved. The majority, at least, of the prospective strikers should approve of the action and that by secret, free and unhampered vote."[17]

In discussing the ethics of warfare, theologians treat of the conscientious objector—the man who is convinced that his country is waging an unjust war. A similar case can occur in connection with a strike. An individual worker may be convinced that a strike, in which he is expected to co-operate, is unjustified. What course of action should he pursue? To say that he should continue to work in the shop or factory, while his companions quit, is certainly not practical, for his individual contribution to the work of a large plant (or that of a few workers of the same persuasion) would be valueless. Besides, a protest of this nature would inevitably bring the conscientious objector into disrepute with the union, and perhaps be a handicap to future employment; and he would not be obliged to endure this grave inconvenience, at least under normal circumstances. Perhaps we can find a parallel between this case and that of the citizen conscripted for the purpose of engaging in a war which he deems unjust. The latter could allow himself to be drafted into the army, but he would not be permitted to take part in hostilities against the enemy.[18] Similarly, the union member, convinced that his union is not justified in going on strike, could nevertheless walk out with the others, but he should not actively participate in the strike by making speeches in favor of the strikers, by picketing the plant, etc.

Very rarely can it happen that those civil officials whose functions directly concern the preservation of peace and safety are justified in striking, even though they are being subjected to conditions that are not equitable. For the harm done to the public by such a strike is usually so great as to cancel completely whatever benefit it might produce. This would hold particularly in reference to policemen and firemen. In discussing the Boston police strike of 1919, an editorial in the *Catholic Charities Review* states: "It may safely be asserted that no grievances are ever so great as to render morally lawful the strike of the city's police

[17] Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

[18] Cf. Merkelbach, *op. cit.*, II, n. 275.

force in the United States."[19] By similar principles, though not to the same degree, a severe judgment would have to be passed on the strike of government employees the suspension of whose tasks for a considerable time would be gravely detrimental to the public welfare—for example, schoolteachers or public health officials. A strike on the part of those government employees whose duties are merely of a clerical or secretarial nature would be judged by practically the same norms as those applied to workers in private industries—at least, if these are not bound to service by an oath.

However, even in the field of private industry, special attention must be given, when the morality of a strike is in question, to one whose participants are persons employed in the task of providing commodities necessary for the preservation and protection of life and health, such as food and fuel. A most grave reason is required to justify such a strike in view of the harm it will work on the public. This is particularly true in our modern complex social order, in which certain industries can dominate practically every other form of labor. The coal strike recently conducted at the command of Mr. John L. Lewis is a proof of the paralyzing blow that can be dealt to the entire nation by a comparatively small number of workers who withdraw from their jobs. There are many in our land today who believe that special legislation should be enacted to prevent strikes in such key industries, and it would be tragic if excessively rigorous legislation should nullify the proper use of the worker's right to go on strike. But, whatever action may be taken by our civil legislators, Catholics should be reminded that a strike in which the public is injured to a measure far exceeding the advantages the workers may gain, is proscribed by the law of God. Furthermore, even from the standpoint of personal interest, workingmen should realize that such far-reaching strikes are likely to act as a boomerang, stirring up the antagonism of the public to labor unions, and perhaps leading to undue legal restrictions of the workers' rights.

Priests should strive to eradicate the curse of strikes from civilized society, particularly by preaching the truly Catholic principle that the best remedy is to establish an industrial system in which the employee is recognized and treated as a co-partner

[19] *Catholic Charities Review*, Editorial, November, 1919.

of his employer.[20] But in the meantime, we must accept the occurrence of strikes as inevitable and endeavor to diminish their number and lessen their effects. Priests are naturally more sympathetic toward the employee than toward the employer. Indeed, this is in accord with the mind of Our Lord Himself, for as Pope Leo XIII tells us: "The favor of God Himself seems to incline more toward the unfortunate as a class; for Jesus Christ calls the poor blessed, and He invites most lovingly all who are in labor and sorrow to come to Him for solace, embracing with special love the lowly and those harassed by injustice."[21] But in passing judgment on the lawfulness of particular strikes, we must be purely objective, blaming the workers when the stoppage of work is an abuse of their right to strike. Indeed, when we consider the conditions laid down by reliable theologians for the justification of a strike, we must honestly admit that not a few strikes in our land in recent years would seem to be unjustifiable, according to Catholic moral principles. And if strikes continue to occur for any great length of time with the frequency and magnitude of those we have witnessed in recent times, we have every reason to expect grave economic and social injury to the American nation. We must use the knowledge we possess from the teachings of our Church, and especially from the papal encyclicals, to instruct our people as to what is just and what is unjust in settling industrial problems, and use our influence toward the solution of these problems in a way that will be fair to both capital and labor.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.
The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[20] Cf. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

[21] *Rerum novarum*, in *Acta Leonis XIII*, IV, 264; *Principles of Peace* (N.C.W.C., Washington, D C., 1943), n. 138.

MISSION INTENTION

"Success of the Chinese Missions under Peaceful Conditions" is the Mission Intention for the month of February, 1947.

THE ASSUMPTION IN LITURGY

The feast which we call that of the Assumption of Our Lady has been variously entitled *Pausatio*, *Nativitas*, *Mors*, *Depositio*, and *Dormitio Virginis*. Whatever the title, two events in the life of Mary are commemorated: her death and her bodily assumption into heaven. The assignment of Aug. 15 as the date of this feast is generally said to have arisen from the anniversary of the dedication of a church, in honor of the Blessed Virgin, as the actual anniversary of her death is not known any more than the year or even the place in which it occurred. In Egypt and Arabia, the earliest feast of Our Lady was celebrated in January, whence it is said that the observance spread to Gaul, where, in the sixth century, the feast was celebrated in mid-January, *mediante mense undecimo*, in a calendar whose initial month was March.[1] There is a tradition that the feast of the Assumption originated at the time of the Council of Ephesus and that Pope St. Damasus introduced it in Rome. We have authority for its observance in the month of August in Palestine before the year 500.[2] It is well known that a proclamation of the Emperor Mauritius (582-602) decreed its celebration throughout his empire on Aug. 15 instead of Jan. 18. In this edict, the Emperor styles the feast "The Falling Asleep of the All-Holy Mother of God." (κοίμησις τῆς παναγίου καὶ Θεομητέρος).

According to Duchesne there was at Rome, from the seventh century onward, a solemn station on Jan. 1, at the Basilica of *Sancta Maria ad Martyres*, which had no reference to the present-day solemnity of the Circumcision but had the official designation of *Octavas Domini* and was a kind of renewal of the festivities of Christmas, though with particular application to the Blessed Virgin Mary.[3] So, today, in the Mass for Jan. 1 in the Roman Missal, the liturgical text has notable commemoration of Our Lady, in the Collect and the Postcommunion. From early medieval times, there were four great feasts in Rome in honor of Mary, namely: the Purification, the Annunciation, the Assumption, and the Nativity. The most ancient of these is the Purification, which began as a feast of Our Lord, that of the Presentation of the Child Jesus in the Temple, but because of

[1] Cf. Gregory of Tours, *De gloria mart.*, I, 9.

[2] Cf. Bäumer, *Geschichte des Breviers*, p. 185.

[3] Cf. *Origines*, 5th ed., p. 290.

its inevitable association with Our Lady became in the Western Church the feast of her Purification. The feast of the Annunciation was likewise in origin a *Festum Domini*, that of His Incarnation, but it too naturally became a feast of Our Lady. With these two days were eventually, from the time of the Council *in Trullo* (692), enumerated two other commemorations of the Blessed Virgin, that of her birth (Sept. 8) and that of her death and assumption (Aug. 15). Duchesne tells us that these four festivals are of Byzantine origin and that they were introduced into the Roman Liturgy but not into the Gallican until the latter was revised in accordance with the Roman service books.[4] All four appear in the Gelasian Sacramentary, of the beginning of the seventh century. They did not exist in Rome in the time of Pope St. Gregory I. Not only does he not speak of them but there is no mention of them in liturgical documents concerning the Roman usage prior to the seventh century, like the Leonine Sacramentary.[5] They became great festivals soon after St. Gregory's reign and were celebrated with solemn processions in Rome from the time of Pope Sergius I (700). Our present liturgy retains the procession only for the feast of Feb. 2. The Rite of Lyon, however, still directs a procession to be held, not only before the Mass on Candlemas Day but likewise on other feasts of Our Lady, including that of her Assumption.[6] On the other hand, the Liturgy of the Ambrosian Rite has no Mass for the feast of the Assumption or at least had none up to the year 1906.[7]

There seems to be no adequate explanation of how the dates, Sept. 8 and Aug. 15, came to be accepted as those of Our Lady's birth and death. The Tenth Council of Toledo, held in 646, mentions a feast of the Blessed Virgin to be observed on Dec. 18, eight days before Christmas. A month later, around Jan. 18, in several Gallican books there appears a day dedicated to the memory of Our Lady. Thus, the Lectionary of Luxeuil sets aside for this observance a date after the Second Sunday following the Epiphany but before the feast of St. Peter's Chair, which is assigned to Jan. 18. The *Missale Gothicum* places this feast between the Epiphany and St. Agnes (Jan. 21). The Missal of Bobbio has it occur between Epiphany and Lent but after the festival of the Chair of St. Peter. All these accord with the time

[4] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 289.
[5] Cf. *ibid.*
[6] Cf. King, *Notes on the Catholic Liturgies*, p. 117.
[7] Cf. *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, art. "Assumption."

of the pre-Mauritian observance of the feast in the Eastern Empire, to which reference was made in our opening paragraph. The Gallican date of the feast of the Blessed Virgin on or about Jan. 18 under the title of *Depositio*, *Assumptio*, or *Festivitas Sanctae Mariae*, gives some support to the opinion that this rite is of Eastern origin, since this was the date, referred to above, of the special cult of Our Lady practiced by the monks of Syria and Egypt.[8]

We have many instances of cognate festivities of the Blessed Virgin associated with the day dedicated to her privilege of Assumption. For example, in Gerace in Calabria, three days of celebration, all *duplicia primae classis*, commemorate her death on Aug. 15, her Assumption on the 16th, and her coronation in heaven on the 17th. The Brigittines observe a feast of the glorification of Mary on Aug. 30, a date arrived at from the revelations made to St. Bridget of Sweden to the effect that Mary was taken, body and soul, into heaven fifteen days after her death. We have heard of feast-days in Bavaria and elsewhere in Germany fixed to the 23rd day of September, founded on the belief that forty days after her death Our Lady was transported into heaven. This interval between her death and Assumption is evidently based on that between the Resurrection and Ascension of Our Lord, though revelations attesting a period of this length are said to have been made to St. Elizabeth of Schönau (†1165) and St. Bertrand, O.C. (†1170). A feast of the coronation of the Blessed Virgin, fixed to Aug. 18, is reported as observed in certain dioceses of Central America.

Some of the old service books, both Roman and Gallican, have as the text of the Mass for the feast of the Assumption formulas of prayer more distinctive than those found in the Roman Missal of today. The *Missale Gothicum* (seventh or eighth century) has in the Preface: "Non solum mirabilis pignore quod fide concepit sed translatione praedicabilis qua migravit."[9] In the *Contestatio*, we read: "Nec resolutionem pertulit in sepulchro, pollutione libera, germine gloriosa, assumptione secura, paradisi dote praelata."[10]

The *Sacramentarium Gallicanum*, usually known as the Missal of Bobbio, a liturgical document of the sixth or seventh century,

[8] Cf. Mabillon on the Gallican Liturgy, *MPL*, LXXII, 180.

[9] Bradshaw Texts, *The Missale Gothicum*, I, 30 f.

[10] *ibid.*

has our Gospel but the Epistle is from the Apocalypse. In the enumeration of the graces of Mary in the Secret there is mention of her Assumption. The *Contestatio*, or Preface in this book has the following pertinent sentences:

"De mundo migravit ad Christum, germine gloriosa assumptione secura, paradisi dote praelata . . . . non subdita labore per partum nec dolore per transitum."[11]

Coming to the ancient Sacramentaries of the Roman Rite, the Gregorian Sacramentary, dating from probably the eighth century, although no extant manuscript except the imperfect palimpsest of Monte Cassino is free from Gallican revisions, contains the following forms in the Mass for the Vigil of the Assumption: *Super Oblata*: "Magna est Domine apud clementiam tuam tuae genetricis oratio quam idcirco de praesenti saeculo transtulisti ut pro peccatis nostris apud te fiducialiter intercedat." And *Ad complendum*: "Concede, misericors Deus fragilitati nostrae praesidium ut sanctae Dei genetricis *requiem* celebramus, intercessionis ejus auxilio a nostris iniquitatibus resurgamus." This Postcommunion prayer is identical with ours for the 14th of August, except for the word *requiem* which with us reads *festivitatem*. Our present Collect of the Mass of the Vigil is the same as that given in the Gregorian Sacramentary.[12]

For the day of the Assumption itself, the Gregorian book has as the first Collect of the Mass: "Veneranda nobis Domine hujus est diei festivitas in qua sancta Dei genetrix mortem subiit temporalem nec tamen mortis nexibus deprimi potuit, quae filium tuum Dominum nostrum de se genuit incarnatum."

An alternate oration, marked *Alia ad Missam*, is identical with the Collect for the feast in the Roman Missal today, one of so generic a character that it might be said on any festival of Our Lady. The Secret, the *Super Oblata* of the Gregorian Sacramentary, is word for word the same both in the old service book and in the present Missal. There is, however, in this prayer some reference to the feast of the day in the words: "etsi pro conditione carnis migrasse cognovimus, in coelesti gloria apud te pro nobis intercedere [*orare* in the Sacramentary] sentiamus." On the other hand, our Postcommunion has greater *à propos*

[11] *Ibid.*, *The Bobbio Missal*, pp. 40 f.

[12] The text furnished here is from Leitzmann, *Das Sacramentarium Gregorianum* (Münster, 1921).

than the *Ad complendum* of the Sacramentary. While the text in both is almost identical, the early book refers simply to *festa Dei genetricis* while our Missal says: *qui assumptionem Dei genetricis colimus.*[13]

In the Roman Liturgy, the feast of the Assumption is of the highest rank, *duplex primae classis*, celebrated with an octave from the time of Pope Leo IV, in 847. It is a holy day of obligation in the universal Church, though not observed as such in Canada. In medieval times, it was known as Lady Day in England, the post-Reformation designation of Bank Holiday remaining an evident vestige of its popular celebration in Catholic times. The text of the present Mass is not distinctive. Indeed, the Mass of the Vigil is of less general application to any feast of Our Lady. The Vigil borrows its Introit from the feast of the Annunciation and its Gradual, Gospel, and Communion verse from the Mass of the *Commune Beatae Mariae Virginis.* Its Epistle is proper, being another example of referring texts which apply primarily to the Divine Wisdom to her through whom He was brought into this world. Though both Collect and Postcommunion are of a general character, the Secret has this allusion to Our Lady's death and assumption: "Quam idcirco de praesenti saeculo transtulisti."

For the Mass of the day of the Assumption itself, the present Mass in the Roman Liturgy has as its Introit a variation of that said on the feast of All Saints, which is itself an adaptation of the form originally proper for the Mass of St. Agatha, beginning with the words, *Gaudeamus omnes in Domino*, inserting *de cujus Assumptione gaudent Angeli*, where we find *de quorum solemnitate gaudent Angeli* on Nov. 1, and *de cujus passione gaudent Angeli* on the feast of St. Agatha (Feb. 5). The Collect is of generic nature without any reference to the event commemorated by the feast. The Collect in the seventh century Gelasian Sacramentary, the predecessor of the Gregorian book, speaks of the *iterata solemnitate*, indicating a previous celebration perhaps of the death as distinguished from the Assumption of Our Lady, which formed the subject of a synaxis anciently held at the end of the vigil preceding the feast. The Epistle, from the Book of Ecclesiasticus, is appropriate as containing the words, *qui creavit me requievit in tabernaculo meo*, since the Divine Maternity is the

[13] Cf. *ibid.*

raison d'être of all the special privileges of the Blessed Virgin, including that of her Assumption. The Gradual quotes verses from Psalm 44, which find frequent liturgical application to Our Lady. The Gospel contains nothing proper to the feast save the veiled reference in the concluding words: "Maria optimam partem elegit quae non auferetur ab ea." The Alleluia verse and the Offertory are free adaptations of the Introit and the *Communio* repeats the conclusion of the Gospel. Only the Secret, with the words cited above: "etsi pro conditione carnis migrasse cognoscimus," makes anything like the commemoration of the fact of the Assumption which we noted in the Gallican service books. The Postcommunion, it is true, substitutes the word *Assumptionem* for the *festa* of the Gregorian Sacramentary but this is far less distinct an expression than the phrases which are found in the *Missale Gothicum* and the Missal of Bobbio. It is to be regretted that no proper Preface has been assigned to the feast of the Assumption comparable to those in the Gallican service books. We must rest content with the insertion of the word *Assumptione* in the place reserved for the name of the feast in the Preface common to all Masses of the Blessed Virgin.

The Oriental Liturgies all observe a festival in honor of the Assumption of Our Lady. Though the Greeks call the feast κοίμησις, or Falling to Sleep, they nevertheless believe in the transfer of Our Lady, body and soul, to heaven. The name, μετάστασις, Departure, or Passing-Beyond, also occurs among the Greeks.[14] In some places, the Byzantine Church protracts the feast to Aug. 23 and on Mount Athos it is observed until Aug. 29.[15] The Assumption is celebrated by the Syrians, both Jacobite and Catholic, and by the Chaldeans, both dissident and Catholic. The Gregorian, or schismatic, Armenians, as well as the Catholics of that rite have the feast also. The Armenian Rite observes the feast (*Verapochum*) on the Sunday occurring between the 12th and 18th of August. The Copts, of both allegiances, schismatic and Catholic, celebrate a feast of the Assumption but its date is the ancient one of Jan. 16 (21st *Tybi*). The Abyssinians number the Assumption of Our Lady among their thirty-three feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary.[16]

[14] Cf. Nille, *Kalendarium Manuale*, I, 245.

[15] Cf. *Menaea Graeca* (Venice, 1880).

[16] Cf. Janin, *Les rites orientaux*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1926), pp. 394, 438, 495, 584, 607.

It is to be hoped that, if the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin is solemnly defined as a doctrine of Catholic faith, the Holy See will grant a new Mass, whose text will have more direct reference to the subject of the feast, and perhaps a proper Preface, with sonorous cadences similar to those of the festival of Christ the King, celebrating the glories of Mary taken up into heaven.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the February, 1897, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* Msgr. Anton de Wall, writing from Rome on "The Psalms in the Catacombs," narrates that at the burial of the early Christians it was customary to sing psalms of joy and triumph, the ceremonies being repeated on the seventh and thirtieth day and each recurring anniversary. He recommends that Catholics be urged to return to the custom of using the psalms regularly in their devotions. . . . Abbé Hogan, continuing his series on clerical studies, enumerates the qualifications of a good historian—a critical judgment, love of truth, a good imagination and memory. . . . The second instalment of an article by Fr. Brandi, S.J., translated from the Italian, on Pope Leo XIII's declaration of the invalidity of Angelican Orders, points out that it has been the unwavering belief of the Catholic Church from the time when the Edwardine Ordinal was first used that the ordinations conducted according to its rites were null and void, and that it has been the invariable custom to ordain absolutely those who had received Anglican Orders and who later, on conversion to the Catholic faith, were admitted to the priesthood. . . . A writer who conceals his identity under the pen name of 'Ο ΘΑΡΣΕΥΣ discusses the decree of the Third Baltimore Council on Faith and claims that an undesirable spirit of liberalism is manifesting itself in America, the particular tendencies being an exaggerated spirit of nationalism to the detriment of the true spirit of Catholicism, an undue emphasis on the value of the physical sciences, disrespect for authority, and the false charity that would make common cause with non-Catholics in sacred things under the plea of being broad-minded and liberal. . . . There is a lengthy review of a pamphlet written by an Anglican, Dr. Mortimer, taking exception to Pope Leo XIII's decision on Anglican Orders. Dr. Mortimer asserts that a decree of the Holy Office, given in 1704, declared "Receive the Holy Ghost" a sufficient form for the priestly ordination. The reviewer informs us that this so-called "Abyssinian decision" was actually only a *votum* submitted to the Holy Office, but never given any approval.

F.J.C.

ST. JEROME: HIS LIFE AND BIBLICAL WORK

In the year 344 Eusebius Hieronymus was born of Christian parents in the small Dalmatian town of Stridon. It is impossible to locate accurately his birthplace because Stridon, overrun and pillaged by barbarian hordes, has become one of the many forgotten towns of Europe. Constantine the Great was not yet dead ten years, and the Empire he left was split up by bickering factions and rival claimants to power. Unlike so many of God's Saints, the boy Eusebius, or Jerome as he is known to us today, gave no early indications of either great sanctity or extraordinary brilliance. His early life seems to have been little different from the customary life of a growing boy. Thanks to a remarkable memory, Jerome himself has preserved for us a picture of the early days of childhood.

> I shall make you [Rufinus] laugh though you are a man of such extreme gravity; and you will have, at last, to do as Crassus did, who, Lucilius tells us, laughed but once in his life, if I recount the memories of my childhood; how I ran about among the work-shops of the slaves; how I spent the holidays in play; or how I had to be dragged like a captive from my grandmother's lap to the lessons of my enraged Orbilius.[1]

When Jerome was eighteen, his father, judging that the lad had outgrown the private tutoring in Stridon, decided to send him to Rome where one was sure to find the best teachers in the Empire. Here he enrolled in the School of Rhetoric under the famous Donatus[2] and spent his time reading and commenting on Virgil, Sallust, Plautus, Lucretius, and Terence, names still familiar to the classical student in our American schools. For the first time, Jerome gave signs of that intellectual curiosity and remarkable power of assimilation which were to mark his later life, and "with great care and toil" began to form a library for himself. At the age of twenty he was baptized in Rome, probably by Pope Liberius; a fact which may startle us today, but which was not an unusual practice in the early Church. Ambrose, in fact, had not yet received baptism when, by popular acclaim, he was chosen to be Bishop of Milan.

[1] *Apology Against Rufinus* (*MPL*, XXIII, 422).

[2] *Ibid.* (*MPL*, XXIII, 410).

After these early studies in Rome, Jerome, in the company of his friend Bonosus, travelled through Northern Italy and Gaul. It was probably during these three years that the future Doctor resolved to dedicate all his talent and energies to the service of God, especially in Sacred Scripture and the promotion of asceticism. A tranquil period of three years follows at Aquileia, where a society of congenial minds gathered around Jerome, already recognized as a leader among his contemporaries. His first extant letter, "To Innocent," is a product of this residence at Aquileia.[3]

We can only speculate on the reasons why the devoted band of disciples broke up, but in a later letter to Rufinus, Jerome implies that there was violent pressure brought to bear against them. The letter is also valuable as a brief record of the subsequent journeys and trials of the Saint.

> After that sudden whirlwind dragged me from your side, severing with its impious wrench the bonds of affection in which we were knit together, I wandered about, uncertain where to go. Thrace, Pontus, Bithynia, the whole of Galatia, and Cappadocia, Cilicia also with its burning heat, one after another shattered my energies. At last Syria presented itself to me as a most secure harbor to a shipwrecked man. Here, after undergoing every possible kind of sickness, I lost one of my two eyes; for Innocent, the half of my soul, was taken away from me by a sudden attack of fever.[4]

Jerome had seen enough of city life in Rome to realize its incompatibility with a life of study and spiritual progress, and the austere life of the solitaries in the desert had always exercised a fascination over him. So to the wild Desert of Chalcis, east of Antioch, he betook himself for the next five years, where he found all the hardships and trials he had expected but not all the consolations nor quiet for which he longed.

In what is perhaps his most famous letter, the twenty-second, to Eustochium, Jerome lays bare his soul during this period, and in that record we can see all the frailty, strength, trust in God, and profound humility of the man.

> How often, when I was living in the Desert, in the vast solitude which gives to hermits a savage dwelling-place, parched by a burning sun, how often did I fancy myself among the pleasures of Rome! I

---

[3] *Epist.* 16 (*MPL*, XXII, 358).

[4] *Epist.* 3 (*MPL*, XXII, 333).

used to sit alone because I was filled with bitterness. Sackcloth disfigured my unshapely limbs and my skin from long neglect had become as black as an Ethiopian's. Tears and groans were every day my portion; and if drowsiness chanced to overcome my struggles against it, my bare bones, which hardly held together, clashed against the ground. Of my food and drink I say nothing; for, even in sickness, the solitaries have nothing but cold water, and to eat one's food cooked is looked upon as self-indulgence. Now, although in my fear of hell I had consigned myself to this prison, where I had no companions but scorpions and wild beasts, I often found myself amid groups of girls. My face was pale and my frame chilled with fasting; yet my mind was burning with desire, and the fires of lust kept bubbling up before me when my flesh was as good as dead. Helpless, I cast myself at the feet of Jesus, I watered them with my tears, I wiped them with my hair; and then I subdued my rebellious body with weeks of abstinence. I do not blush to avow my abject misery; rather I lament that I am not now what once I was. I remember how I often cried aloud all night till the break of day and ceased not from beating my breast till tranquillity returned at the chiding of the Lord. I used to dread my very cell as though it knew my thoughts; and stern and angry with myself, I used to make my way alone in the desert. Wherever I saw hollow valleys, craggy mountains, steep cliffs, there I made my oratory, there the house of correction for my unhappy flesh. There also—the Lord Himself is my witness—when I had shed copious tears and had strained my eyes towards heaven, I sometimes felt myself among angelic hosts, and for joy and gladness sang: "because of the savor of thy good ointments we will run after thee."[5]

In this diary of an extraordinary soul we have Jerome of the El Greco painting, courageously battling against temptation and discouragement as he makes himself ready for the great tasks God had in store for him. It is worth noting that part of his asceticism in the Desert consisted in the first attempts to learn Hebrew; not a bad discipline, it must be admitted. Securing the help of a converted Jew, who was a master of the language, Jerome, the fluent Ciceronian, set about the work of learning a new alphabet and pronouncing the harsh and guttural sounds of the Hebrew.

What labor I spent upon this task, what difficulties I went through, how often I despaired, how often I gave up and then, in my eagerness

---

[5] *Epist.* 22 (*MPL*, XXII, 398f.).

to learn, commenced again, can be attested both by myself, the subject of this misery and by those who then lived with me. But I thank the Lord that from this seed of learning, sown in bitterness, I now cull sweet fruits.[6]

The life in the Desert was not all solitude and there was more than the lonely struggle against temptation and discouragement. Jerome's fellow-anchorites seem to have caused him no little trouble with their bickerings and accusations. Jerome met their constant challenges of his orthodoxy but their captious demands of almost daily confessions of faith finally exasperated him and drove him from his desert retreat. In fact, he would have left earlier, in the company of some of his friends, had not physical infirmities and the rigors of the climate prevented him.[7]

Returning to Antioch, Jerome was ordained a priest by Paulinus, himself a storm-center of theological strife, but finally recognized as the true Bishop of Antioch, at the Second General Council of Constantinople, at which both Jerome and Paulinus were present. At the invitation of Pope Damasus, already acquainted with the learning of Jerome and his reputation as a champion of the ascetical life, Jerome came to Rome in the year 382. Here he began his first great work on the Bible, the translation of the Psalms from the Septuagint, and a revision of the New Testament, with the help of the original Greek. Jerome cut through all the divergencies of the current Latin versions and went back to the Greek to correct the mistakes introduced by careless or ignorant translators and critics. With a cautious deference to popular taste he adds in his Preface: "To avoid any great divergencies from the Latin which we are accustomed to read, I have used my pen with some restraint, and while I have corrected only such passages as seemed to convey a different meaning, I have allowed the rest to remain as they are."[8] Jerome was later to feel the sting of popular prejudice when he put Jonas under an ivy instead of a gourd.[9]

It was during this stay at Rome that his convictions on the inadequacy of translations of the Old Testament from the Greek

[6] *Epist.* 125 (*MPL*, XXII, 1079).

[7] *Epist.* 17 (*MPL*, XXII, 360).

[8] *Quattuor Evang.* (addressed to Damasus) (*MPL*, XXIX, 528).

[9] *Epist.* 112 (*MPL*, XXII, 930).

alone became crystallized. The Septuagint translation, a Greek version completed a century before the birth of Christ, had its obvious limitations. And Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, despite their honest labors, had done little to improve the Septuagint. As Jerome saw so clearly, the old flavor of the original was lost in these translations: "But if anyone thinks that the grace of language does not suffer through translation, let him render Homer word for word into Latin. I will go farther and say that, if he will translate this author into the prose of his own language, the order of the words will seem ridiculous, and the most eloquent of poets almost dumb."[10] With these shortcomings in mind, Jerome never lost contact with the Hebrew which he had, with such great effort, mastered while in the Desert. In several of his letters he has left us a charming picture of the gatherings of his devoted disciples at the home of Marcella, on the Aventine. And while the crowds howled at the Circus and the cruel shows of the arena drew their regular patrons, the praises of God were sung in Hebrew under the direction and encouragement of this Saint and scholar. To answer their questions on Scripture he wrote innumerable expository letters, while his counsels on spiritual perfection make an invaluable contribution to ascetical literature.

With the death of Damasus in 384, Jerome became again as one who was vainly trying to "sing the Lord's song in a strange land." Enemies, of whom he had more than a Saint's share, savagely turned on him. His biting satire on the follies of Rome, his mastery of penetration into human chicanery and disingenuousness, had left their mark on many a man and woman in the ranks of high Roman society.[11] And he was not easily forgiven. Resolved to quit Rome forever and return to the Holy Land, he has left this valedictory to one of his disciples, Asella:

> I write this in haste, dear Lady Asella, as I go on board, overwhelmed with grief and tears; yet I thank my God that I am counted worthy of the world's hatred. Pray for me that, after Babylon [Rome], I may see Jerusalem once more. . . . I was a fool in wishing to sing the Lord's song in a strange land, and in leaving Mount Sinai, to seek

---

[10] *Preface to Chron. of Eusebius* (*MPL*, XXVII, 36f.).

[11] Jerome's skill as a critic of his age has received convincing treatment in Professor Rand's scholarly work *Founders of the Middle Ages* (pp. 102-134).

the help of Egypt. I forgot that the Gospel warns us that he who goes down from Jerusalem immediately falls among robbers, is spoiled, is wounded, is left for dead.[12]

This was in 384, and two years later, after travels through Antioch, Jerusalem, and Egypt, he finlly settled at Bethlehem for the remainder of his life. We would be wide of the mark if we supposed that the next thirty-four years he spent at Bethlehem were years of uninterrupted activity on his cherished aim, to translate the entire Old Testament from the Hebrew. The care of at least two monasteries, the constant visits of pilgrims, sickness, the estrangement with his bishop, John of Jerusalem, and the sacking of his monastery by the Pelagian heretics in 417 were but some of the factors which cut into the time allotted to the vast project which Jerome had conceived.

JEROME AND THE BIBLE

The first thing to keep in mind in evaluating Jerome's work on the Bible is his fundamental principle that you must go back to the original if you want a trustworthy version. This simple rule was the fruit of long years of study and experience with manuscripts and versions, both classical and sacred. With one eye on the apologetic use of the Scriptures, Jerome saw, while at Rome, how hopeless it was to argue merely from Latin versions of the New Testament. "For if we are to pin our faith to the Latin texts, it is for our opponents to tell us *which;* for there are almost as many forms of texts as there are copies."[13] Just as the true text of the New Testament requires for its decision an appeal to the original Greek, so the true text of the Old Testament can only be tested by reference to the Hebrew. After painstaking study of the Hebrew, Jerome saw immediately that the Septuagint or Greek translation did not preserve the flavor of the sacred record, although he always treated it with the greatest reverence because of the use which the Evangelists and Paul, make of it.

We do not know today just what Hebrew manuscripts Jerome had when he began his work. Yet he was too conscientious to use bad texts, or to use his sources indiscriminately. With the

[12] *Epist.* 45 (*MPL*, XXII, 482).

[13] *Preface to Vulgate Version of N. T.* (*MPL*, XXIX, 526).

scholar's instinct for accuracy, he determined, from the beginning, to accumulate the best copies of the Bible along with the best commentaries. The Library at Caesarea, built up by Origin and Eusebius, was at his disposal; and he worked over copies of the Old Testament procured from the synagogues of Palestine. By tireless checking and comparison of texts he sought to get at the actual genuine text of the Hebrew Old Testament. Knowing full well that a strictly literal translation is unsatisfactory, Jerome set out to render the *sense* of the Hebrew into good Latin. The faithful translator should try to preserve the idiom and charm of the original, as far as accuracy will permit. Provided you do not change the sense of the original, much less foist new doctrines on the reader, one is granted a generous liberty in turning the original into a readable translation. "A slavishly literal translation from one language into another obscures the sense; the exuberance of the growth lessens the yield. For while one's diction is enslaved to cases and metaphors, it has to explain by tedious circumlocutions what a few words would otherwise have sufficed to make plain."[14] But in this same letter Jerome has admitted to Pammachius that he does not allow himself the same freedom in translating Sacred Scripture as, say, in translating the Chronicle of Eusebius.

Achievement should be measured by the difficulties met and overcome. We have already seen sufficiently how health, controversy, and the ever-pressing work of guiding others in the spiritual life took valuable time and broke up that sustained tranquillity which is indispensable for scholarly work. Add to this the dull-wittedness of professional copyists, used for dictation, who sometimes had little or no understanding of what they were writing. Even Jerome complains of the already corrupted state in which he found his first correction of the Latin Psalter.

But these obstacles are only extrinsic to the work set before the great Doctor. What of difficulties inherent to the work of translation? Translation has been called a literary device by which unequals are represented as equals. And remember that Jerome was not translating from one Western language into another, as Cicero and countless others had done before him. He was to take a Semitic language, different in idiom, imagery,

[14] *Epist.* 57 (*MPL*, XXII, 572).

structure, and vocabulary, and transfer the thought into a suitable Latin medium. Imagine a Chinese scholar translating "Othello" into Chinese, without sacrificing the dramatic power of that English masterpiece, and you have a fair modern parallel. To Jerome's everlasting credit, he overcame this difficulty in finding a medium which preserved the primitive simplicity and elevated tone of the original. A non-Catholic scholar has payed a graceful tribute to Jerome's success in handling this knotty problem of translation:

> This [his translation] was his great and indefeasible title to the appellation of a Father of the Latin Church. Whatever it may owe to the older and fragmentary versions, Jerome's Bible is a wonderful work, still more as achieved by one man, and that a Western Christian. It almost created a new language. The inflexible Latin became pliant and expansive, naturalising foreign Eastern imagery, Eastern modes of expression and thought, and Eastern religious notions, most uncongenial to its genius and character, and yet retaining much of its own peculiar strength, solidity, and majesty.[15]

The verdict of history sheds new lustre on this monumental work which came out of Bethlehem. Perhaps more than any other influence, it made Latin the language of the Church, and helped to keep it so. No other single book has so profoundly influenced the literature of the Middle Ages. Books of Ceremonies, Breviaries, Mediaeval Plays, books of devotion and even the great works of philosophy and theology acknowledge their debt to Jerome. And were you to peep over the shoulder of a monk working at his desk in the scriptorium you would see him patiently transcribing some portion of the Vulgate. In the course of time new Latin versions of the Scriptures began to appear and with them, the danger of abuses arising over the number and variety of translations. To forestall this danger, the Council of Trent, in a disciplinary decree, declared in favor of that version which had been received in the Church for so many centuries. From that time, the Vulgate became the official text for public use in any country where the Latin language was in use. With the exception of a few books in the Old Testament, this authentic version, known as the Vulgate, had come from the pen of Jerome.

[15] Dean Millman, quoted in *The Religion of the Scriptures* (St. Louis and London, 1925), p. 91.

The Saint and Doctor, after a year's illness, died at Bethlehem and was buried beside two of his faithful disciples, Paula and Eustochium, near the Grotto of the Nativity. But the City of David was to yield up its precious treasure, and the remains of Jerome were transferred to Rome, where they rest today in the Church of St. Mary Major, which houses the Crib in which Christ was born. "Would that Rome had what tiny Bethlehem possesses," Jerome had once written in a letter;[16] a wish fulfilled in a manner which the great Doctor never foresaw. On Christmas Eve, the faithful assemble at the Church of St. Mary Major for the Midnight Mass, the liturgy of which is so largely taken from the translation of Jerome. No greater tribute could be paid by a Mother to her devoted son.

FREDERICK L. MORIARTY, S.J.

St. Robert's Hall,
Pomfret, Conn.

[16] *Epist.* 54 (*MPL*, XXII, 557).

CARDINAL GIBBONS ON LOYALTY TO CHURCH SUPERIORS

The disposition to criticise the conduct and administration of superiors would be moderated in tone, and would be rendered less frequent by reflecting that to the Faculty, and not to the subordinates is given the grace of ruling well; that the removal of an occasion of complaint sometimes involves the sacrifice of a greater good; that in the human breast there lurks a perverse tendency to censure those who, by their official position, are exposed to public view; that we are all more prone to discover faults than to recognize points of excellence; and that submission to the yoke of discipline is not congenial to the natural man, but always demands a generous self-sacrifice.

—James Cardinal Gibbons, in *The Ambassador of Christ* (Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1896), p. 79.

Every priest who knows himself will know what it is to be discouraged, saddened, depressed by a multitude of crosses and disappointments, but none are so heavy to bear as our own conscious unworthiness.

—Henry Edward Cardinal Manning, in *The Eternal Priesthood* (Baltimore: John Murphy Company, no date), pp. 140 f.

PARATROOPER PADRE

[Editor's Note: *This is the fourth in a series of articles made up of excerpts from letters written to members of his family by Fr. Francis Sampson, Chaplain with the 101st Airborne Division during World War II. These letters were written partly during the European campaigns and partly while Fr. Sampson was on shipboard during his return to the United States. The last installment, which appeared in the January, 1947, issue of this* Review, *ended with the arrival of the author at Stalag II A, following his capture by the German forces during the Battle of the Bulge.*]

PART IV: PRISONER OF WAR

At long last the day that I have looked forward to for so many months in England, in France, in Belgium and Holland, and especially in Germany . . . the day when I shall be aboard a ship and headed for home has finally arrived. Some soldiers love to speak about their war experiences. Others feel that the whole subject of war is distasteful, and want nothing so much as to forget the whole thing. I am someplace in the middle of these two groups. I don't mind speaking about combat occasionally, but I do dislike it as a regular topic of conversation. At first I thought that on getting home I could tell the story to the whole family assembled. But then some of the family wouldn't be there, and I would have to repeat and repeat. So, I thought that by writing the story of what happened in prison camp I would not disappoint anyone, and still would have my sixty-day leave for a good rest, which I really do need. There is little to do on board ship, unless you are a gentleman of chance and roll the bones. An hour or so a day at the typewriter helps to pass the time.

Stalag II A, we soon discovered, was a camp for enlisted men only, and we officers had been sent there by mistake. The German Commandant of the camp told us that we would remain for a couple of days and then would be marched to the officers camp about two hundred kilometers away. The American "Man of Confidence" (the title given to the soldier that the Americans selected to represent them to the German authorities) came to me and asked whether I would be willing to stay at this Stalag since

there were between five and six thousand Americans there without any officer or chaplain. I was glad to accept, but the Germans were unwilling that any officer remain in an enlisted men's camp, although the Geneva Convention Articles clearly prescribe that prisoners of war shall have the services of their own chaplains if such are available. The Germans couldn't see it that way however, so the resourceful "Man of Confidence" had recourse to other means to bring about the desired end. He contacted the Serbian doctor who had been of tremendous help to the American sick and wounded. The Serb doctor examined me, and diagnosed a case of double pneumonia. Tired and weak as I was I found it quite easy to act the part of the patient. After the rest of the officers were marched out of the camp a couple of days later I made a quick recovery, and, despite certain misgivings of the German Commandant, was permitted to remain at the camp until the end of the war. The Commandant even obliged me by granting an *Ausweis* (pass) and freedom of all the various compounds within the camp.

If you have ever seen one of our prison camps for German PW's in the United States don't get the idea that you know what a camp for American PW's in Germany is like. The only similarity is the high fence, the coils of barbed wire and the guard towers. Aside from these essentials of any PW camp, the difference is greater than between Park Avenue and Mott Street. The filth of the camp strikes one at first as appalling, but one seems to get more or less numb to it as time goes on, and it still remains a mystery to me why typhus and typhoid epidemics did not occur. The camp had separate compounds for the Serbs, Dutch, Poles, French, Italians, Belgians, Russians, Americans, and British. In all there were about eighty thousand prisoners registered in the camp, but about half of these were out in working groups and never returned to the camp except to bring in the sick.

The first week or so of prison life still seems more like a dream to me than reality. I had seen the German PW camp at Camp Forest, and had expected about the same thing in Germany, without the same quality or quantity of food, of course. What I found is common knowledge now, for newspapers and newsreels have not spared the American public's sensibilities regarding this necessary bit of education. The weather was bitter cold and the suffering intense. The Americans had been in the camp only about

five months and consequently were in far better shape than the other prisoners, some of whom had been there for over five years. The daily food ration per man consisted of a bowl of soup (so-called), a tenth of a loaf of bread, and a cup of tea which the men used for shaving water, for they couldn't drink it. Four days a week each man received a couple of potatoes. The soup was invariably either cabbage (with worms) or rotten turnips (with worms). The men of course were very thin, and many of them became sick and some died. Fortunately for all of us, Red Cross parcels came through after I was there a short time.

One of the first things I wanted to do was contact the priests in the camp. There were six priests in the French compound, two Dutch priests, and an Italian and a Polish priest. Each of them greeted me with sincere warmth, and together they rounded up Mass equipment for me. Many of the French and Poles worked downtown (Neu-brandenburg) for which they were compensated, and they were able to bribe the guards to get wine and hosts from the local German priest. The French had also made a very devotional and artistic chapel out of one of their barracks. All the French priests had been enlisted men in the French army and consequently had to work for the Germans. The oldest among them, however, was a very wonderful man with the charm and kindliness of a St. Francis de Sales. His thick hair was long and white, as was his neatly trimmed beard. The Germans seemed to respect him, and he was given freedom of the camp. The rest of us priests considered ourselves his curates, and I received tremendous help from his kindly advice and priestly example. We spent many enjoyable evenings together. Though no one was permitted to go out of the barracks after eight p.m., I would frequently sneak out to visit M. l'Abbé in his barracks, and we would talk most of the night, using a goulash of his bad English, my worse French, our questionable Latin, and pidgin German. Our desperate efforts to express ourselves so delighted the old priest one night that he let out a loud laugh, and a guard passing by came to the window and turned his flashlight on us. The old priest reassured him.

A shipment of boxes labeled "Red Cross" and addressed to American Prisoners of War arrived at the camp one day. The men grouped about those huge cartons thinking that at last food had arrived. Weak and emaciated as they were, they anticipated

a real treat of good American food. You can imagine their pathetic feelings when the cartons were opened only to reveal their useless contents . . . football shoulder-pads, tennis racquets, and other items for which we had neither the space nor the energy to waste in their use.

This disappointing shipment, however, was followed a week later by the arrival of Red Cross food parcels, and other shipments kept us pretty well stocked for the duration of the war. You might be interested in what a food parcel contains: three small cans of pressed meat, a can of salmon or tuna fish, a can of cheese, a can of powdered milk, two bars of real chocolate, a box of sugar squares, a can of soluble coffee, a box of raisins, vitamin tablets, a box of crackers, a can of oleo or butter, and, most precious of all (especially for their bartering value), five packages of cigarettes. Each man was issued a parcel per week, and we shared our parcels with the British in the camp, alloting them one parcel per man each week.

Through our food parcels we became the aristocracy of the camp. Even the Germans were not eating as well as we were in some respects. Our coffee, chocolate, and cigarettes were especially desired by the Germans, and bartering and trading became the most intriguing and profitable occupation in the American compound. German guards could scarcely restrain their enthusiasm for American cigarettes, and since the demand was so great on their part for our luxuries, which we had in some abunddance, it became expedient that we set up our own OPA price scale to prevent an inflation and a cheapening of our own goods. To maintain our cigarettes and coffee at the highest possible worth we computed and posted our trade value in this manner:

Kriegies: Observe this price scale, and keep the value of cigarettes up!

For 1 two-lb. loaf of bread—give no more than 10 cigarettes or ½ chocolate bar.

For a 2 lb. sack of flour—give no more than 15 cigarettes.

For 1 doz. eggs—give no more than 25 cigarettes or 1 chocolate bar.

For 1 good chicken—give no more than 1 small can of soluble coffee.

For 12 large onions—give no more than 12 cigarettes or ½ chocolate bar.

For 1 good pair of gloves—give no more than 15 cigarettes.

For 1 lb. beefsteak—give no more than 25 cigarettes or 1 chocolate bar.

By and large the Americans stuck pretty close to the price scale, except when they could strike an even better bargain, which of course was not contrary to our OPA intentions. Despite the manner in which American GI's squander their money when they have plenty, they are still the world's best traders and keenest bargain-makers when they have little to give in exchange. All this probably strikes you as very amusing, and, as I reflect upon it, it tickles me to think of the German guards smuggling various food items past their own guards to get in exchange the coveted American cigarettes, chocolate or coffee. But believe me, the actual bartering was a serious matter between the Germans and the Americans. And I doubt whether the Wall Street wizards have juggled millions of bushels of wheat with greater self-interested cunning than a Kriegie wielded his mighty cigarette to his own advantage. Since there were no Pure Food Laws within the camp the GI never scrupled to mislabel or misrepresent his article. One night I recall that a German guard came into the barracks and produced a fine hen from under his "great coat" (the "great coat" worn by guards is a huge garment that hangs all the way to the ground and is large enough for two men). He wanted one of our tiny cans of soluble coffee and fifteen cigarettes for his hen. The GI's felt they could do better. (Usually three or four Americans would buy something like this together and would pick the sharpest fellow to do the trading.) This particular American haggled and argued with the guard for well over an hour until the exasperated German finally agreed to trade his hen for the coffee and to forget the cigarettes. The matter having been settled, the articles were exchanged. The American felt the chicken critically and the German sniffed the coffee suspiciously. They parted, each quite satisfied that he had made a good bargain. About twenty minutes later the German came back . . . angry, fuming, and spouting German faster than my untrained ear could follow. I asked him what the matter was. It seemed that the can of coffee he had received for his hen turned out to be in reality just a can of sand with a sprinkling of coffee on top. Realizing the impossibility of locating the swindler, the German had to content himself with a few anti-Semitic invectives against all Americans.

I was very anxious to organize a good religious program for the American and British compounds. We set aside one corner of a

barracks for a chapel sanctuary, and we employed the very considerable artistic talent in the camp to make this corner as beautiful and as devotional as our limited tools and materials permitted. We were able to bribe the guards for the lumber necessary to build an altar. Several scarlet blankets were obtained by the same means. The altar was built on a platform with three steps leading to it. The blankets were cut to make an antependium and a backdrop for the crucifix which was carved out of a block of wood by an Italian prisoner. By our usual means of a bribe we obtained from a German guard paper and a complete set of pastel crayons. With these the Serbian artist did a magnificent job on the Stations of the Cross. By means of a couple more chocolate bars we got two more scarlet blankets with which we covered the crude Communion rail. With the material left over we made a canopy for the altar. An American Jewish boy painted a lovely Madonna and a picture of St. Joseph for the sides of the altar. A German guard became interested in the project and obtained wiring material and a socket was placed behind the canopy. When the light was turned on the effect was so satisfying that I question whether any priest ever gazed upon his church with greater satisfaction and joy than did I upon our humble prison sanctuary. It became very truly a spiritual oasis for our homesick boys. Many a lad during our long days, weeks, and months of imprisonment found relief there in a quiet prayer. Many found there the fulfillment of our Lord's promise, "Come unto Me . . . and I will refresh you."

A couple of men also built a small room for me adjoining our little chapel, and I was there able to have the privacy necessary for confessions and consultations. Each day most of the Catholics attended Mass, although I was forced to limit Communions to Sunday only, because of the difficulty of obtaining hosts. We had no large hosts at all and used the small ones for Mass and quartered these on Sunday for communicants. Twice a week I held a non-denominational service for the Protestant men. Religion was a constant subject of conversation and the entire credit for the large number of converts belongs to several Catholic men who knew their religion, knew how to present it properly, and knew how to live it well. One young fellow in a nearby working camp instructed and baptized nine men, although he had never been beyond the first year of high school himself. A

check proved that his instructions had been thorough and his converts solid Catholics.

The entertainment in the camp was homespun, but really quite good on the whole and varied enough to interest everyone. For violations of discipline, lack of cleanliness, etc., the Man of Confidence imposed fines . . . forfeiture of some parcel item from a cigarette to a can of coffee, depending upon the gravity of the offense. With these fines musical instruments and other entertainment materials were bought from the Germans. (Incidentally, the Chaplain's fund . . . to pay for hosts and wine . . . was constantly augmented by the contribution of one cigarette exacted from any man I caught using bad language.) A hill-billy quartet was only too willing to entertain at any time of the day or night. They were indefatigable and their repertoire inexhaustible. Another man, "Chick" by name, had had considerable experience in vaudeville, and the shows he organized and put on were very clever and great morale builders. The shows became a bit ribald at times and I had to needle "Chick" occasionally, but he took it well and tried to co-operate, although he couldn't control the asides and the adlibs. One night "Chick" staged a minstrel in the barracks. The make-ups and constumes were masterpieces of Yank ingenuity. Most of the jokes and songs were racy and crudely insulting digs at the Germans. It so happened that a couple dozen guards got wind of the show and came to see it. They set there and laughed and laughed at every joke and song. The colored costumes with bright ties tickled them to death. The Americans were pretty apprehensive until they saw that the Germans didn't understand a word or catch any of the insinuations. Then the GI's got a big wallop out of that . . . the Germans laughing at the show, and the Americans laughing at the Germans who didn't know that they were being ribbed. I was more than a little relieved when the show was over, and the Germans slapped the members of the cast on the back and muttered something about Americans being "good comrades." The best of the entertainers, however, was a string quartet. The violinist had played for years in the Boston Symphony—with a name like Elephtherios Elephtherokos what else could he be but a musician . . . or possibly a wrestler? The bass viol player and the guitar player had studied their instruments for years and were excellent. The vocalist, a cadaverous Sinatra-appearing lad, had

a soft dreamy voice, and had sung for several name bands in the States. The total effect was quite professional.

One of the most interesting characters in the camp was Zaza. Zaza was a little Italian boy who was brought to the camp when he was only two and a half years old. His parents had been killed in a bombing early in the war. An Italian soldier had picked him up and taken him to the camp. So Zaza had been reared in this abnormal environment. He never had known or played with other children, and his manners were very grown-up. The stocky little fellow looked like a midget Mussolini, although he couldn't tolerate being called "Mussolini." Zaza in this strange environment had matured way beyond his years; he fixed his own bunk, went to bed and got up when he chose, washed his own clothes, and prepared his own food. He was given freedom of the entire camp, and he could speak fluent Italian, Polish, German, and French, and could get along fairly well in English. I once asked him if he would like to come to the United States with me. He rubbed his chin for a minute and then said in English, "I think America be vera vera nice, but Italy want us there, many things to build in Italy when war is over." I never ceased to be astounded by his mature outlook, but I fear his abnormal childhood will result in later emotional crises.

One day I went to the bathhouse to take a shower (a unique privilege the German Commandant had granted me). The German in charge, however, said that there was no water. On my way back to the American compound I met Zaza, who had the same bathhouse privilege. "Whasa mat?" he asked. "The Heinie says 'no water,' " I replied. Zaza laughed, "He is liar," and he went into the bath house. I waited to have a laugh at Zaza's disappointment. Pretty soon Zaza stuck his head out the window and called, "Come, didn't I say he is liar?" We both had a good shower.

The saddest part of prison life was the lack of the bare essentials for medical care. Quite a number of Americans and British had arrived at the camp with frozen feet. The Serbian and the Polish doctor did everything they could and worked with heroic patience and skill, but they were hopelessly handicapped by lack of supplies. Five men had to have both their legs amputated and eighteen had one leg amputated. Many wounded men were serious gangrene cases, and the Lazaret was filled with

pneumonia and dysentery patients. Some of these poor boys died. The Polish doctor would sometimes actually cry when he was forced to use toilet paper as compresses and newspaper for bandages. The wounded and the sick were cared for by our medical aid men with the greatest solicitude and, I might add, with unashamed love. Nothing, I believe, refines men's characters so much, or makes men so Christ-like, patient, and self-sacrificing, as caring for the sick and the helpless. The Polish and the Serbian doctors will always remain in my mind as the finest Christian examples of a profession second only to the priesthood in the dignity and greatness of its mission.

We buried an average of two Americans and two British a week. All of the Catholics were anointed and received Viaticum (a French priest had provided me with an oil-stock). The Protestant men readily said the Acts of Faith, Hope, Charity, and Contrition after me, and, I have no doubt, were very well received by Him Who also died a prisoner. The Germans, as usual, were more solicitous toward the dead than they were toward the living. We were allowed to take eight pallbearers and an honorary group of twelve men to escort each body from the hospital (about a half mile from the camp) to the cemetery. The pallbearers carried the body in its wooden coffin on their shoulders. As the procession passed the camp on its way to the cemetery on the hill everyone in the camp turned toward the procession, paused and saluted the deceased, a small act that never failed to impress me deeply. After the burial ritual I always felt obliged to say a few words to those in attendance . . . usually something like this: "Though we bury our comrade-in-arms here in six feet of foreign soil; though thousands of miles from his home and unattended by his family and friends; though he be buried naked in this crude coffin; and though his Prisoner of War tag remain with him still, nailed to a crude marker; these are superficial and relatively unimportant things. The important thing is that in the supreme moment of his life he was given the grace of a holy and Christian death; the important thing is that he has been liberated by his Saviour's love from the prison of this life. Today we represent his family, his country and his Church. As his family would wish we offer up our prayers for his soul. His country, we remind ourselves, must ever be grateful for the price he paid for our freedom. His Church recognizes here a sacrifice closely linked

to the sacrifice of the Crucified." Taps were blown and we returned to the camp.

Out of the twenty-one thousand Russians that had been registered in the camp eighteen thousand died, most of them of starvation. Every day the pitiful sight of a wagonload of naked corpses on its way to cemetery hill made us Americans mighty grateful for citizenship in a "grasping Capitalistic country that has no regard for the masses." Believe me, the Russians that survived needed no argument other than the sight of our Red Cross parcels to convince them that there was something mighty phony about Uncle Joe and the government of the proletariat.

The hatred of the Germans for the Russians was incredible. The Russian dead were buried in pits, five hundred to a pit. On one occasion when I was burying an American and a couple of British men a Russian corpse had mistakenly been placed along side of the other three, and all four bodies were buried in coffins. When the Germans discovered the mistake the next day they dug up the Russian and dumped his body into the pit for the Russian dead. Many Russians were buried while still breathing. It was also a common thing for the Russians to keep their dead with them for days so that the dead man's rations could be drawn from the kitchen, and at roll call the dead would be held upright by the men on each side in the close, tight formation. Authentic cases of cannibalism occurred among the Russians. Horrible as this sounds I have come to believe that there is nothing that a starving man will not do, and who can say that these poor creatures were responsible for their actions? I know that this sounds like Hollywood wartime propaganda at its worst, but there are hundreds of American soldiers who can substantiate every word.

A little Russian boy fourteen years old was caught stealing potatoes from the kitchen. The German guard made the lad lie flat on the ground and stretch out his arms, and the guard shot him through each hand. One of the American aid men cared for the boy's wounds and we collected some food for him. A couple of weeks later our "Man of Confidence" managed to get the boy into our infirmary (so-called) and when his wounds healed somewhat he remained to help our own aid men. He carried bed pans, washed and shaved the sick, scrubbed the place regularly, and became devoted to the Americans. I have never seen a happier

boy in my life than when some Red Cross clothing came in, and we fitted the lad in an American uniform.

Not many Americans attempted escape, and those who did attempt it were unsuccessful. We were guarded closely (except toward the very end of the war), and no one was allowed out of the barracks at night. We had also seen the German police dogs go after a crazed Russian who had desperately tried to squirm and dig under the fence. Of the twenty or so Americans who tried to escape none were successful, and three were killed by the Gestapo. We were several hundred miles in the interior of Germany, and the people were jittery and armed to fight the expected American and Russian airborne landings in the interior of Germany.

About the first of March the Swiss Red Cross representatives arrived at the Camp to hear our complaints against the German treatment and to make the proper adjustments. Incidentally, the Germans, upon the arrival of the Red Cross men, served the camp prisoners the first palatable soup we had seen, and even gave every man a double ration of bread, a ration of sugar, jam, potatoes, and two inches of bologna. The Swiss failed to help the prisoners very much, but one thing they did do that I appreciated was to get a pass for me to leave the camp to visit American working groups within a radius of a hundred miles. I availed myself of this privilege to the utmost, and I kept a guard busy constantly escorting me on a bicycle about the country. The guard would invariably want to visit friends or relatives on these trips, and in this way I became quite well acquainted with many German families. The German families seemed to me to be very closely knit units with most if not all the virtues of hard-working Christian people. I am quite convinced that they were in great part ignorant of the atrocities perpetrated upon the conquered peoples. They did not condone the evils they saw in their government, but by nature the German people seem to have an exaggerated respect for authority, no matter how unworthy that authority might be. Fear, too, was obviously a deterrent from any expressions of dissatisfaction with those in power. The people treated me kindly and with respect and reverence, and everyone of them seemed to think that I ought to know this or that relative in America, for the relative had prospered greatly. The American working groups that I visited on these trips were

making out much better than the boys in the camp, for the rations were far better. They too had received Red Cross parcels and were able to barter not only with the guards, but with civilians as well.

An American Colonel who had become sick on a prisoner march from Poland was left at Stalag II A about the middle of March and remained for two weeks. He was a very clever man, and during the first few days in the camp he was able to have a radio smuggled in piece by piece. We had tried this before but had never been able to assemble a complete radio. He told us that the BBC was broadcasting instructions every week to prisoners of war, and as the war drew to a close it was essential that we comply with these orders. The great problem was to find a suitable place to hide the radio, for the Gestapo each month made a thorough inspection of every barracks. They would pull up the floor boards, take the bunks apart, and probe the ground around and under the barracks—in short they did their job thoroughly and well. Finally an idea dawned upon me that might offer security for our radio. I had a boy build a little pulpit for my chapel, and he did a masterful job in fixing a little trap door on the top. He then covered the whole thing with a piece of the scarlet blanket material, and inserted a long spike into a hole that kept the trap door tight. By pulling out the nail the door would fly open and the radio could be used. The first time we tuned in on the BBC, a chill ran up and down my spine. It almost seemed like our liberation. Of course we had to use the radio with the utmost caution, and could not even let our own Americans know that we had it. The reason for the secrecy with our own men was that the Germans had a "plant" among us, that is, a German who had been in America, who spoke perfect English, and about whom we would have no suspicion. A "plant" is a common means for the detaining government to pick up valuable information dropped by prisoners of war, and also a very effective means of preventing escapes. We had our suspicions as to who the "plant" was, but we were never sure until the last couple weeks of the war when he was so careless one night as to talk in his sleep. The information came through perfectly as to what we were to do during the last few weeks of the war, and this knowledge proved of tremendous value.

One Sunday morning shortly before our liberation a very em-

barrassing thing happened. It was during Mass and I was just about to begin the sermon. I had forgotten to put the spike back securely in the trap door, and as I rested my arm on the pulpit and quoted my sermon text: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you," the trap door flew open and the radio dropped out in front of all the men. There was a long three seconds of silence and then the place broke into a roar. It was with considerable embarrassment that I recovered the radio and stuffed it back into the pulpit, and tried to compose myself and restore order. The constant snickering made it very difficult to concentrate on the sermon, and after about five painful minutes I gave it up as a bad job, and went on with the Mass. The worst part of the accident was the presence in the congregation of two German guards, but when both of them went to Communion I felt pretty sure that they would say nothing. These two guards had been very decent and quite helpful on many occasions. Just before our liberation when all the German soldiers were taking off towards the west to escape the Russians and to surrender to the Americans I gave each of these two guards a note to the Americans who picked them up that they had been friendly and helpful to American prisoners of war. Whether it helped them or not I haven't any idea.

I think that I shall always remember vividly and joyfully Easter in Stalag II A, and I believe everyone who was there will remember it as long as he lives. Good Friday had been observed by Catholics and Protestants alike in the American compound with the Stations of the Cross and an hour's meditation taken from the Imitation of Christ . . . the Chapter on the Royal Road of the Holy Cross. The French priest had managed to have a set of dalmatics smuggled in, and we prepared, without the Germans knowledge, to hold an outdoor Solemn High Mass. The guard crew had been reduced to a skeleton force by this time, for every German under sixty had been sent to the front. Each nation was to be represented on the altar, and each nation had a little choir to sing part of the Mass, with the principal parts to be sung by all the choirs together. We hoped and prayed for a good day and it turned out perfect.

The wonderful saintly old French priest was the celebrant of the Mass. I was the deacon, the Dutch priest was subdeacon, an Italian priest was master of ceremonies, the Polish priest was

assistant master of ceremonies, the Belgian "Man of Confidence" was thurifer, and for acolytes we had a Serb, a Scotchman, an American, and a Russian (the old French priest told me that this Russian was a saint). Two French priests directed and co-ordinated the choirs. About half an hour before the Mass, word was sent to the various compounds to assemble in the big field beside the kitchen. The Germans were too bewildered to make much of a protest, and besides the war was so close to being over that they were very anxious to be friendly. All of the Catholics in the camp and many of the non-Catholics attended, and the number was well up in the thousands, the largest congregation I have ever seen apart from a national Eucharistic Congress. The crowd entirely surrounded the altar and what a sight it was. Many of the Germans were there, not as guards but as worshipers. This was the Catholic Church; here were Frenchmen kneeling next to Serbs, next to Poles, Americans worshiping beside Belgians, beside Italians, Scotsmen finding the bond of brotherhood in the Mass with the Dutch, with Germans and with Russians. There was no argument here, no friction, no hatred, no intrigue or struggle for balance of power. Here was the Christ being elevated again, and drawing all things to Himself. Here was a King whom all could love and obey, and in that love and obedience find the happiness and freedom every man longs for. These were the thoughts of the brief sermon which was preached in four languages by four ministers of the Mass, in French, in English, in Italian, and in Polish. Do you wonder that I shall never forget that Easter? Hundreds of men went to Communion at that Mass, and I believe every American Catholic received. After the Mass the French priest had a little party for the priests and the servers, and it was then that he paid the finest compliment to American Catholics that I have ever heard. "You Americans," he said, "are the world's greatest lovers of the Eucharist."

Shortly after this we heard the tragic news of President Roosevelt's death. I held a solemn memorial service, and every nationality in the camp sent its highest ranking representative to attend. Later in the day a formation of all the Americans and British in the camp was held, at which the representatives of the various nationalities extended their sympathies to the Americans and extolled the virtues of our past great leader. I said a prayer for the divine help and guidance of his successor. Taps were blown

and the formation was dismissed. It was amazing to see the profound effect President Roosevelt's passing had upon the men.

We knew the day of liberation could not be far away. Russian artillery could be heard in the distance, and German civilians were evacuating Neu-brandenburg, traveling on anything that had wheels. Confusion and terror among the civilians and the retreating German wounded was the order of the day. I thought I had almost become emotionally numb to the sight of suffering and death, but the events of the next several days were to instill in me an even greater disgust and abhorrence for war than I had before.

(To be continued)

Des Moines, Iowa. FRANCIS SAMPSON

TWO GREAT PRELATES OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL

Cardinal Manning was the most emaciated prelate I ever met. His bloodless face was almost transparent. Owing to his weak digestion, he habitually ate very sparingly of the simplest food. When obliged to dine out, he partook only of a biscuit and a glass of water, for he never indulged in wine even in his feeblest condition. He was most indefatigable in active labors, and a close student as well. When travelling, he read and even wrote. In the notice of his *Religio Viatoris,* he states that "being for many days on a journey without work or books, I thought that it might be a fair time to write down, in fewest words, the reasons for what I believe." The little book remains as he then penned it. This is a fair sample of his habit of improving every hour, and of studying and writing while others under similar circumstances would feel justified in taking rest. Archbishop Spalding said to him in my presence, during the Vatican Council: "I know not how Your Grace can work so hard, for you scarcely eat or drink or sleep."

Archbishop Spalding, of Baltimore, was not only a laborious missionary, but also a diligent student, a prolific writer, and an indefatigable preacher and lecturer. I never knew him to decline an invitation to preach even during his much-needed summer vacation. Wherever he was sojourning, the people, without distinction of faith, were eager to hear him. Though a man of untiring energy, he was, during the last twenty-five years of his life, a chronic sufferer from an acute form of bronchial and gastric affection.

—James Cardinal Gibbons, in *The Ambassador of Christ* (Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1896), pp. 215 f.

SIX-THIRTY

One hand gropes for the alarm clock, two feet hit the floor. Another victory is achieved; another day begins.

Sometimes I have felt that a priest's salvation is determined during those first ten seconds after Big Ben sounds his call. It is so easy to say to oneself, "Just five more minutes." The five minutes become fifteen or thirty, and then there is a quick splashing of water and a mad dash for the altar. The day's work starts, with nothing more than the vesting prayers to give it pace and meaning.

Strangely enough, we can repeat that performance morning after morning, without perceiving the childishness of it. We set the alarm one hour in advance of Mass as a half-hearted salve to our consciences; we will not admit even to ourselves that we really have no intention of getting up at that time.

It is not this way with everyone, but it was this way with me for a long time after I left the seminary. As I fit a new blade to the razor (there's far more lift in a clean-shaven face than in ten minutes extra sleep), my thoughts go back to those early days as a priest. It puzzles me now to understand how I could so often have over-slept, more than once keeping the people waiting for Mass. I cannot understand why I did not perceive the spiritual softening and weakening that lack of prayer brought in its train. It amazes me to think that I could ever have been content with a hastily formed intention as I walked from rectory to sacristy.

This sounds like the reminiscing of a self-righteous prig. But I do not mean that I am a good priest, even now. I only mean that I have been a worse one. In all probability I should have been a much worse one, but for the act of God and my Bishop which made me pastor of my own small parish where I had to give the Sisters Holy Communion an hour before Mass. On an empty stomach the morning paper and the radio have no appeal for me. So, with an hour to kill, I settled down at a *prie-dieu* in the sanctuary, and life began—at thirty-four.

(As I dry my face and give my head a quick rub, I reflect that I shall never be canonized; they will find hair-tonic in my medicine cabinet). Now why did I have to wait for nine years to learn something that I should have realized when I left the seminary?

I had had the necessity of prayer drummed into me, but I wasn't, apparently, convinced of it; I wasn't sold on it. Perhaps the seminary's sheltering walls gave us a false feeling of confidence. We left those walls under an initial impetus administered from without . . . and we thought it was spiritual energy driving from within. The hard part was over; we could ease up now; we could coast along. We had heard of fallen-away priests, of course, but somehow they didn't seem any more real than Martin Luther. We didn't visualize them as having once been young priests like ourselves, equally self-confident—cocky is perhaps the word.

Why is it that we leave the seminary, grown men of twenty-four or more, still in the formative stage? One is tempted to wonder (I'm only ruminating, of course, as I button my cassock) whether the seminaries couldn't do a better job of making us into adults before ordination. I do not mean that the *neo-ordinatus* should not be childlike, with the simplicity of a clear conscience. I mean that he should not be childish in the approach to duties and the acceptance of responsibilities.

(A whiff of fresh morning air greets me as I open the door. The lilacs by the side porch are almost in bloom.) The "curfew" rules for assistants, effective in many rectories, seem a tacit admission of failure somewhere along the line. I don't mean that the curfew rules aren't necessary. But am I wrong in thinking that they *shouldn't* be necessary?

(The convent door is ajar for me. It is seven o'clock and the Sisters are waiting.) I'm glad I'm not a Bishop or a seminary rector. Just the same, I wish there were some way to start us out in life with a more solid piety and a better-developed sense of responsibility. I wish we didn't have to learn so much the hard way.

LEO J. TRESE

Carleton, Mich.

THE CHURCH MILITANT

The vicissitudes of this daily warfare mark the stages of every Christian's life. The fight begins the moment the baptized soul becomes conscious of its responsibilities, and ends only at death.

—Cardinal Mercier, in the *Conferences Delivered to His Seminarists at Mechlin* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1943), p. 137.

THE SPIRITUALITY OF THE DIOCESAN PRIESTHOOD

During the past decade, and particularly during the past three years, the question of a special spirituality for secular or diocesan priests and seminarians has been the subject of lively and illuminating debate among theologians both in this country and in Europe. By far the greater part of the literature about this matter appeared in France during the war years. Thus, at the time of its publication, it was not available to the priests of this country. Yet, because of the acute and pressing importance of the problem under discussion and because of the valuable contributions which various participants in the debate made to the science of sacred theology, the question is definitely of interest to our American priests, both diocesan and religious.

RECENT LITERATURE ON THE DIOCESAN PRIESTHOOD

Chronologically the first and still one of the most important of these very recent works on the nature and the prerogatives of the diocesan priesthood was the book *De l'éminente dignité du sacerdoce diocésain*,[1] written by the eminent French theologian, Canon Eugène Masure. Canon Masure, Rector of the Major Seminary at Lille, was already well-known for two previous works, *La grand' route apologétique* and *Le sacrifice du Chef*. In 1941, Dr. Gustave Thils, professor of sacred theology at the Major Seminary of Malines and now a lecturer at the University of Louvain, published the first edition of his *Le clergé diocésain*.[2] Dr. Thils, whose distinguished study *Les notes de l'église dans l'apologétique catholique depuis la reforme* had already marked him as one of the oustanding theologians of Europe, intended his 1941 publication of *Le clergé diocésain* as the first part of a more complete treatise. In 1942 he published another theological study on the nature and the function of the diocesan priesthood in his book *Mission du clergé*.[3] The third and most important of Dr. Thils' contributions in this field appeared in 1946. It is a volume entitled *Nature et spiritualité du clergé diocésain*.[4] This

[1] Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1938.

[2] Bruges: Desclée, De Brouwer.

[3] Bruges: Desclée, De Brouwer.

[4] Bruges: Desclée, De Brouwer.

seems to have been the most influential single contribution to the current literature on the subject.

Prior to the 1944 meeting the Cardinals and Archbishops of France, there was sent to all of the Ordinaries of that country an inquiry about the opportunity for giving to diocesan priests and to candidates for the diocesan priesthood "a strongly doctrinal spirituality, a spirituality of the Church [a practical teaching of spiritual direction founded upon the theology *de Ecclesia Christi*], setting forth in full clarity the proper characteristics of the secular clergy's vocation."[5] Taking cognizance of the responses to this inquiry, Archbishop Émile Guerry, Coadjutor-Archbishop of Cambrai, made his report to the assembly of French Cardinals and Archbishops in February, 1944. The Archbishop later published this report under the title *Le clergé diocésain en face de sa mission actuelle d'évangélisation.*

Beginning with its first number for 1945, the important French publication *L'Union apostolique de France* opened its pages to debate on the question of a particular spirituality for diocesan priests. In this magazine two secular priests, Fr. Aimé-George Martimort and Fr. Robert, the former a member of the faculty of sacred theology in the Catholic Institute of Toulouse, published excellent papers. In line with his teaching, Fr. Martimort last year brought out a volume *De l'Évêque.*[6] The problem was also discussed in January, 1945, at a session of liturgical studies at Vanves, near Paris. *De l'Évêque* is, in substance, a paper which Fr. Martimort read at this assembly. The Dominican publication *La Maison-Dieu* printed in its third issue for 1945 a series of letters with reference to Fr. Martimort's paper. This series includes a communication from Fr. H. M. Féret, O. P., of Le Saulchoir, a reply by Fr. Martimort, a response from Fr. Féret, a letter from Archbishop Guerry, and a summation by the editors of *La Maison-Dieu*, Fathers Duployé and Roguet. Another Dominican, Fr. Robillard, contributed to the February, 1946, issue of *La vie spirituelle* a paper "La spiritualité du clergé diocésain."

In 1945 Fr. Georges Lemaître published his book *Notre sacerdoce*,[7] generally and rightly acknowledged as one of the most im-

[5] Quoted in the *Nouvelle revue théologique*, LXVIII, 2 (March, 1946), p. 192.

[6] Paris: Éditions du Cerf. This book carries a preface by Cardinal Saliège.

[7] Paris: Desclée, De Brouwer. The preface to this book was written by Archbishop Guerry.

portant treatises on the spirituality of the diocesan priesthood. The March, 1946, issue of the *Nouvelle revue théologique* carries highly competent criticisms of *Notre sacerdoce* and of Dr. Thils' *Nature et spiritualité du clergé diocésain* by the Louvain Jesuit, Fr. René Carpentier. In this same number Fr. Carpentier has published a paper entitled "La spiritualité du clergé diocésain,"[8] in which he gives a fine summary of the French literary contributions to this discussion, offers certain valuable suggestions on the matter, and takes issue with some opinions offered by Fr. Martimort and Dr. Thils. Another Jesuit theologian, Fr. Michel Olphe-Galliard, gives brief but excellent notices of the books by Thils, Martimort, and Lemaître in the Jan. 1946 number of the *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique.*

The spirituality and the position of the diocesan priesthood have been treated in two recent Latin works, both of which appeared in Italy. The first was the monograph *Sacerdotium saeculare et status religiosus*,[9] published in 1940 by the Claretian writer, Fr. Antonio Peinador. Fr. Peinador confines himself to the thesis that the position of the religious priest is more perfect than that of his diocesan confrere. The second contribution, which upholds the same thesis but which has far more than a merely polemic value, is the book *De sanctificatione sacerdotum secundum nostri temporis exigentias*,[10] by the eminent Dominican theologian of the Angelico, Fr. Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange.

In our own country one brochure, *The Calling of a Diocesan Priest*,[11] dealt with the problems raised by Masure, Thils, Martimort, and Lemaître, although it was written in 1944, quite indepently of the French and Belgian discussion. Within the past few months, however, two of the most distinguished members of the American hierarchy have written extremely valuable papers on the spirituality of the priesthood. His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman has described the need for and the direction of supernatural perfection among priests in two recent papers, "The Priesthood," published in the Nov. 1946 number of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* and "For Christ You Are Am-

[8] *Nouvelle revue théologique*, LXVIII, 2 (March, 1946), pp. 192-217.

[9] Rome: Typographia polyglotta "Cuore di Maria."

[10] Rome: Domus editorialis Marietti.

[11] Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Bookshop.

bassadors," which appeared in last month's issue of this same magazine. "The American Priest," written by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, will be published in the next month's issue of the *Review*.

It is interesting to note that the same concern for the proper spiritual direction of priests which prompted Cardinal Spellman and Archbishop Cushing to write their articles resulted in the publication last year of a very distinguished symposium on sacerdotal spirituality by the Gregorian University in Rome. This book, *Il sacerdote e la spiritualità*,[12] contains the papers read at conferences held at the Gregorian University during the spring of 1945. The Most Rev. Abbot Ildebrando Vannucci wrote on "Il sacerdote e la spiritualità benedettina," and five other eminent theologians from the various religious Orders deal with Augustinian, Dominican, Franciscan, Ignatian, and Carmelite spirituality from the point of view of the Catholic priesthood. From the ranks of the secular priesthood, Msgr. (now Cardinal) Ernesto Ruffini wrote a paper on "Il sacerdote e la spiritualità di S. Francesco di Sales," and Msgr. (now Archbishop) Giuseppe d'Avack wrote on "Il sacerdote nel Corpo mistico di Cristo." Cardinal Pizzardo contributed the conclusion to the symposium. Another Italian book, *La scelta della vocazione*,[13] by Fr. Geremia di S. Paolo della Croce, C.P., testifies to the universal conviction about the importance of the question on priestly spirituality.

ORIGIN OF THE DEBATE

The earliest writings in this discussion were prompted by a conviction on the part of those engaged in preparing candidates for the diocesan priesthood that the literature of sacred theology did not contain a sufficient amount of material on the actual status of the secular clergy. There was and there is no lack of ably written treatises on the nature and on the perfection of the religious life. Furthermore there has never been, at least in modern times, any shortage of competently written books about the priesthood. Still, there was obviously not only room but need for writings which would present theologically, factually, and without emotion, an explanation of the position and of the duties

[12] Rome: Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1946.

[13] Milan: Società editrice "Vita e Pensiero, 1946."

proper to the diocesan priesthood. Rightly or wrongly, a great many secular priests were convinced that the spirituality most commonly offered to their own priests and seminarians was something primarily intended for and adapted to the religious rather than the diocesan life. One indication that this attitude was not entirely unfounded is contained in the preface to the 1932 edition of Grimal's famous and excellent set of meditations, *Avec Jésus formant en nous son prêtre.*

In the foreword to this edition, the distinguished Marist author brought out the fact that the first edition, that of 1924, had carried the sub-title *Méditations pour les futurs prêtres et les pères de la Societé de Marie.* He informed his readers that a review in the French paper, *Ami du clergé*, and numerous priests in the ministry and in seminaries had influenced him to bring out this second edition, with the elements which concerned his own religious community left out.[14] As it stood then, a book of reflections for members of a particular religious community, edited in such a way as to omit all that primarily concerned the members of this community, was actually, and it would seem typically, presented as setting forth the proper spiritual instructions for diocesan priests.

Now no one would claim for even a moment that books like that of Grimal were other than useful and edifying reading for members of the secular or diocesan clergy. But, what a great many diocesan priests, men like Masure, Thils, and Martimort, did object to very strenuously and very properly was the contention, real, albeit frequently only implicit on the part of some ascetical writers, that the proper spiritual direction of a diocesan priest or seminarian was basically only an incomplete theology of the religious priesthood. In other words they objected strongly and correctly to the notion that a religious priest was to be instructed in the spirituality of the religious life and in the spirituality of the priesthood, while his diocesan confrere was to receive only this same instruction, minus the elements which directly concern the religious life. They believed that there was a tendency on the part of too many spiritual writers to deal with the secular priesthood as a kind of incomplete religious life. They were convinced that such an attitude wrongly presented the

[14] Cf. *Avec Jésus formant en nous son prêtre*, (Paris et Lyon: Emmanuel Vitte, 1932), I, 6.

diocesan priest as merely a clerical religious *manqué*, and the diocesan priesthood as a sort of partial and imperfect edition of the religious priesthood.

The Dominican Fathers Duployé and Roguet explained this attitude by saying that "the diocesan clergy today feels undeniably a certain inferiority complex in comparison with the religious orders."[15] They support their statement by an appeal to a text in which Archbishop Guerry asserted the necessity of inquiring whether or not there is today a failure to appreciate (*dévalorisation*) of the vocation to the diocesan clergy and whether priests themselves have a sufficient appreciation of their own priesthood.[16] In a culture which could produce such a literary monstrosity as Bernanos' *The Diary of a Country Priest*, it is easy to see how men could feel that the diocesan clergy might have an inferiority complex of some sort or other. Still, it would be both unjust and incorrect to attribute the present study of the spirituality of the secular priesthood to an inferiority complex.

Basically, the inquiry into the spirituality of the diocesan priesthood should not be, and is not intended to be, an expression of rivalry, even of what might be called holy rivalry, between secular priests and their religious confreres. Throughout His public life, Our Lord showed a marked distaste for His disciples' inquiries about the ones who would be greater in the Kingdom. Much of what has been written about "states of perfection" would seem, at least, to parallel such questioning. The only matter with which the already rich literature concerning the spirituality of the diocesan priesthood can legitimately be concerned is the question whether the diocesan priesthood as such can be said to have certain supernaturally revealed teachings primarily and immediately pertinent to itself. Such teachings may be both speculative and practical in import. From the speculative point of view we must ask if there are certain teachings in Our Lord's revealed message which tell of a particular place in the Church and of a particular function in the Body of Christ belonging to diocesan priests. In the practical field we must see if there are certain special duties incumbent upon these men by virtue of the fact that they are, by their very position,

[15] *La Maison-Dieu* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf), III, 88. [16] *Ibid.*

the *presbyterium* of one who rules a diocese as a member of the apostolic college.

THE NEGATIVE POSITION

In the discussion about the spirituality of the diocesan priesthood, all of the writers from the diocesan clergy and from the hierarchy have been in accord on at least the basic point that there is such a thing as a proper spirituality of the secular clergy. This position has, however, been challenged brilliantly and powerfully. Although the opposition has not succeeded in destroying the basic thesis of the diocesan writers, it has, like every other worth-while intellectual movement in the Church's history, contributed a great deal to the understanding of the matter at hand. Thus Fr. Carpentier, one of the most erudite and forceful among the theologians who reject the notion of a proper spirituality for the diocesan priesthood, has brought home facts which will have to be taken into consideration, and which will indubitably play a great part in the theological progress consequent upon this discussion.

Fr. Carpentier seems to dislike the notion of a spirituality proper to the diocesan priesthood primarily on the grounds that the Catholic priesthood is in itself essentially diocesan in function.[17] No theologian can quarrel with Fr. Carpentier's teaching about the apostolic or diocesan nature of that ecclesiastical authority to which all priests, diocesan and religious, and, for that matter, all true Christians, are subject. The Church of Jesus Christ is essentially and visibly apostolic. The primary and central work of the Church, the Eucharistic sacrifice, is an apostolic activity. This Christian sacrifice, offered by the priests of the new law, is the work of the Church, the society within which the apostolic college, subject to Peter, its head, presides. Thus the essential priestly ministry of the altar is necessarily joined to the direction of the apostolic college, which is composed of the residential bishops of the Catholic Church united with the Vicar of Christ on earth.

Fr. Carpentier's point is well taken. The controversy already has had the happy effect of focusing the attention of the theological world upon an all-too-frequently understressed section

[17] Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 200 ff.

of Christian doctrine, that which deals with the place of the existent apostolic college in the life of the Catholic Church. In the light of this truth, expressed by Fr. Carpentier, and still more powerfully by Fr. Martimort, it is obvious that no accurate description of the spirituality of the diocesan priest can be based on the assumption that co-operation in the apostolic labors of the Catholic episcopate is in any way the sole prerogative of the secular clergy. Actually such co-operation belongs necessarily to any aspect of the corporate work of Christ in the Catholic Church.

Both Fr. Carpentier and Fr. Féret dislike the term "diocesan priesthood" on the grounds that it seems to imply a division in the Christian sacerdotal office itself.[18] The Jesuit writer in the *Nouvelle revue théologique* is perfectly justified in his insistence that the status of the diocesan priest does not differ from that of his religious confrere precisely by reason of the sacerdotal character. The sacrament of Holy Orders confers the same powers upon all who received the priesthood, whether they receive these powers for the service of a definite diocese or for the service of a particular community.

Again, although there are many other points on which Fr. Carpentier dissents from the judgments of Fathers Masure, Thils, Martimort, and Lemaître, one contention seems to be his most important contribution to the discussion. He holds that the spirituality of the diocesan priest and seminarian should not differ from that of the religious because, in point of fact, both the religious and the secular are bound to work for the acquisition and the increment in their own lives of spiritual perfection, which must be achieved through the spirit of the vows, through the medium of the evangelical counsels.[19] Since this is the basic element in the spirituality of the religious priesthood, the same doctrine which tends to aid in the formation of the religious priest should be of service to the secular.

EXPLANATIONS OF A DIOCESAN SPIRITUALITY

Some of the theologians who answered the inquiry made prior to the 1944 meeting of the French Cardinals and Archbishops seemed to believe that the spirit of the diocesan priesthood could

[18] Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 193 ff.; *La Maison-Dieu*, III, 71.

[19] Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 205 ff.

be improved by indoctrinating the priests and seminarians with a viewpoint or an attitude analogous to what is known as the spirituality of a relgious community. Thus Fr. Martimort indicated four qualities which he considered as characteristic of the spirituality of a religious order. These were (1) particular stress on the meditation of certain doctrinal points with a view to basing one's spiritual life upon such meditation, (2) a particular effort to perfect oneself in the practice of some individual virtue, (3) certain practices which are considered as means for bringing a man to acquire and to advance in perfection along the lines laid down by the basic meditations, and (4) a grouping of persons for the sake of exploiting common experiences and for the sake of mutual aid in the pursuit of a fixed spiritual goal.[20]

Fr. Robert, on the other hand, believed that the dominant spirituality of a religious order or community was to a great extent fixed by the circumstances of the time when this particular society first came into being.[21] He was alluding to the well-known tendency to see in the spirituality of such great religious groups as the Benedictines, the Franciscans, the Dominicans, the Jesuits, and the Redemptorists, traces of the individual historical circumstances which first motivated the founders of these institutes to bring them into existence. In line with this concept, Fr. Robert saw the proper spirituality of the diocesan priesthood as the spirit of the Gospel working for the supernatural good of the men of our own age. Fr. Martimort, in his contribution taught that the four characteristics of what he considered as the spirituality of a religious community could and should be duplicated in the case of the secular clergy.

To a certain extent, both of these writers were justified in their contentions. There is no doubt whatsoever about the fact that the primary intentions of the founder of a religious community, intentions which could only be understood in their fullness in terms of the particular historical period during which the individual religious community first came into being, play a tremendously powerful part in the spiritual mentality of the priests who receive their spiritual formation within these institutes. Furthermore, by reason of the individual circumstances which prompted the providential founding of these religious orders,

[20] Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 193.

[21] Cf. *ibid.*

each one of them does place a certain stress on certain individual virtues, and upon certain individual aspects of the spiritual life. Each one of them has its own particular system of spiritual exercises, once again based upon the particular purpose for which the individual society was first formed. Finally, each society has its own glorious traditions of service of Christ in the world by men formed and living within this individual religious community.

It would, however, be hopelessly wrong to try and draw a parallel between the individual religious order and the diocesan priesthood as a whole, or between the spirituality of the individual religious community and that of the diocesan priesthood. The diocesan priest is definitely not a member of an individual community, founded within the Catholic Church at a definite period in its history to accomplish some particular good purpose. The diocesan priest is a member of the *presbyterium* of the Church in a particular locality, one of the priestly council which, from the beginning of the Church's history, has been recruited proximately and immediately to aid individual members of the Apostolic college. His approach to the problems of the Church is not one which can bear the marks of any individual period in the history of the Church other than that in which God has called him to work for the glory of His Son.

With its intimate and essential relation to the apostolic college, the *presbyterium* of the Catholic Church as a whole, and the *presbyterium* of each individual diocese within the Church, have a definite tradition. Within that *presbyterium*, each member of the diocesan priesthood has definite obligations, falling upon him by virtue of his status, just as truly as certain other responsibilities and duties fall to the lot of a religious priest by reason of membership in his own society. Yet it would be idle to construct or to consider a spirituality of the diocesan priesthood precisely in terms of that of a religious order or congregation. It would be absolute folly to speak of the spirituality of the diocesan priesthood in a way that would even seem to involve any teaching derogatory to the religious priesthood in the Catholic Church. Actually, a true spirituality of the diocesan priesthood is nothing more or less than a teaching of the revealed doctrine pertinent to the status and the obligations of the secular priest.

FACTORS NOT PERTINENT TO THE SPIRITUALITY OF THE DIOCESAN PRIESTHOOD

In the first place, when we speak of a theology of the diocesan priesthood as something to be desired, we do not mean in any way a system or school of theology distinct from those already in existence. We should insist on this point, since there is a tendency, regrettable though none the less real, to present the spirituality or the theology of the diocesan priesthood as a kind of rival to or substitute for the spirit and the theology of various religious orders. Now there are various theological systems more or less justly identified in the minds of Catholics with various religious communities. Thus, generally at least, Scotism is designated as a Franciscan theology, while Thomism is attributed to the Dominicans and Molinism to the Jesuits, even though the adherents of these theological systems are by no means limited to the orders mentioned.

The theology of the diocesan priesthood will in no way involve the adoption of any particular theological system by the secular clergy. The divergencies in these schools spring sometimes from a mere difference in terminology, and sometimes, too, from out-and-out contradicting opinions presented by the writers and teachers who constitute these schools. Generally speaking, the divergent theological schools are sources of division and confusion in the presentation of the Catholic message. Instead of trying to find the true resolution of those various theological questions around which the different systems revolve, there is a tendency on the part of many authors to concern themselves primarily with the task of justifying the theses of earlier writers who propounded or founded their systems.[22] It will be tragic for the progress of sacred theology if any influential teachers ever treat the question of the theology of the diocesan priesthood in this manner.

Neither, of course, will it be a "new theology" like that type of "theology for the layman" which has been proposed from time to time. There will be no question of any effort to construct a science which has a formal object in any way different from that of the science of sacred theology already existent. It will not constitute an attempt to view the field of revelation in distorted

[22] Cf. *The Concept of Sacred Theology* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1941), pp. 195 ff.

perspective. Such a procedure would involve a really objectionable type of teaching. It would bring about the narrow and particularist teachings against which men like Fathers Féret and Carpentier rightly object. Furthermore, in attempting to deal with divinely revealed truth other than under the aspect of virtual revelation, it would bring into being what could be at best only a parody on theological science.

Finally, the theology of the diocesan priesthood would not consist in the exclusive use of a restricted number of methods for prayer, meditation, and other spiritual exercises. A religious priest may well be inclined, through the traditions of his particular community, to employ certain definite methods for advancement in the spiritual life more frequently than others. He may rightly consider one form of meditation or one process of prayer in a special way bound up with the history and the spirit of his order. No such traditions exist or will exist among the diocesan priests as a whole. By the very fact that they are what they are, the diocesan priests can never point to any one *method* of meditation as belonging in a special way to their company.

THEOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES ON THE SPIRITUALITY OF THE DIOCESAN PRIESTHOOD

The body of divine revelation contains moral teachings which govern the lives of all men. At the same time it carries divinely given directions for men in certain definite states of life. There are obviously certain duties incumbent upon a bishop, by reason of the office he holds. There are other directions for married persons, rulers, servants, and soldiers. There are likewise certain duties incumbent upon a man by reason of his entrance into a religious Order. Undeniably, in the same fashion, there are obligations which a man must fulfill by reason of the fact that he is a diocesan priest. The spirituality of the diocesan priesthood is, in the last analysis, the study of the divinely revealed teaching about these particular obligations.

Like every other section of Christian spirituality, this study on the life of the diocesan priesthood must be placed on a proper doctrinal or speculative foundation. What God has revealed as His instructions and directions for the life and the perfection of the diocesan priest can only be understood in the light of what He

has told us about the nature and the function of the diocesan priesthood itself. Hence the basis for any effective and accurate study of the spirituality of the diocesan priesthood must be found in an examination of the status of the *presbyterium*. Only when we have seen Our Lord's teaching on the position of the presbyter with reference to his own bishop, and hence with reference to the apostolic college as a whole, and only after we have understood the function of the bishop and his presbyters with reference to the local Church and to the individual priests within it, can we begin to appreciate the spiritual life which God demands from members of the diocesan priesthood.

It is certainly a good thing, and, relatively speaking, a necessary thing, to insist in our own time, when the need for diocesan priests is so pressing, upon this theological spirituality of the diocesan priesthood. The development of this section of sacred theology cannot fail to be of immense practical service, not only to the great body of diocesan priests and seminarians, but also to the theological treatise on the Catholic Church and to the theology of the religious life. Once the diocesan priest is brought to realize something like the full dignity and importance of his own position as a member of his bishop's *presbyterium*, and once he realizes his position with respect to his bishop, to the Church as a whole, to his brother priests, and to his own people, the definite and particular supernatural obligations of the diocesan priesthood will stand out with greater clarity.

The diocesan priest is what he is by the fact that he belongs to the *presbyterium* of an individual Church, to the priestly company associated with and subject to an individual member of the apostolic college. Although every aspect and part of Catholic priestly activity is connected with and under the direction of the apostolic college, the status and the spirituality of the diocesan priest are distinct from those of his religious colleague precisely by reason of his essential position in the *presbyterium*. In the light of this fact, it is not too difficult to see the inherent weakness of Fr. Carpentier's objection against the term "diocesan priesthood." Fr. Carpentier contends, and he contends correctly, that the priestly power is the same in all who receive it. He also insists, however, that the position of the diocesan priest with reference to his bishop is consequent upon incardination rather than

upon priestly ordination.[23] In this, of course, he is mistaken. The individual diocesan priest is a member of the bishop's *presbyterium*, and a man becomes a member of the *presbyterium* essentially and primarily by the fact of priestly ordination. It is only when he has been ordained that a man takes his place as a member of that priestly college which acts as the instrument of the bishop, conjoined with and subject to the bishop, in the administration of the diocese. Fr. Carpentier prefers the designation "diocesan clergy," unmindful of the fact that the status of a member of the diocesan *presbyterium* is quite distinct from that of a cleric incardinated into that same diocese. By reason of the fact that the position of a diocesan priest in his own diocese is something which pertains to him precisely by reason of his priestly status, the term "diocesan priesthood" must be judged not only acceptable but useful and significant.

On the other hand, the position of the religious priest within the Church is not completely and essentially fixed by the fact of sacerdotal ordination. The religious priest enters a definite religious society. He stands as a member of that society once he has taken religious vows as its member. He remains a member of that society, subject to its officers and to its rules, even after he has received priestly ordination, It is perfectly true that this society as a whole, and the various individual members of the society, work ultimately under the direction of some bishop. Nevertheless, the individual religious priest's membership in his own *collegium* comes to him by reason of his religious vows, rather than by reason of sacerdotal ordination. The diocesan priest, too, belongs to a *collegium*, the presbyteral company of a definite bishop and a definite diocese. He enters into his *collegium* by the fact of his priestly ordination.

It is this basic fact which renders necessary the study of the spirituality of the diocesan priesthood. It is perfectly true that, as Fr. Carpentier brings out, there is no way to Christian perfection other than through the spirit of the evangelical counsels.[24] Nevertheless, it is not the same thing to work for perfection within a society whose members take the religious vows, as it is to strive for this same perfection in another sort of society, the diocesan *presbyterium*. It is for this reason that the diocesan priests

[23] Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 201.

[24] Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 207.

stands in need of definite spiritual direction and instruction based upon an understanding of the function of his particular status in the Church of God.

There should be no doubt about the need of a definite theological spirituality for the diocesan priesthood. In the absence of such sound and scientific instruction, the diocesan priest and seminarian are almost inevitably bound to have recourse to a desultory and often highly unsatisfactory "spiritual reading" for information and motivation on their own work and their own status. This situation is quite inexcusable today. In the world of business, in the professional and military life, the men of our time have perfected the technique of explaining the position and the function of every class of workers laboring together towards a common goal. The chemist engaged in the task of quantitative analysis would never think of consulting simply "a book about chemistry" for his own instruction. Unless we are willing to expend a like effort in the service of Jesus Christ, we must resign ourselves to the spectacle of a diocesan priest or seminarian looking to "a spiritual book" for information about his highly specialized divine calling. Haphazard spirituality will never help a man appreciate the *presbyterium* and its function in the Church.

There should be little need for worry that a spirituality of the diocesan priesthood will engender disunity within the priesthood or within the Church. Archbishop Guerry somewhat drily observes in his comments on the letters of Fr. Féret: "that, for the diocesan clergy, the danger of a specialization pushed too far appears less pressing than for many other members of the Mystical Body."[25] The true theology and spirituality of the diocesan priesthood cannot fail to bring out the bonds of unity which bind all Christians, and particularly all priests, together in the one Church of Jesus Christ. It will show not only the obligation, but the strength and the meaning of that priestly loyalty through which and in which the disciples of Christ find their unity.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[25] *La Maison-Dieu*, III, 81.

Answers to Questions

"INTERFAITH" PROBLEMS

Question 1: What is to be said of the use of such expressions as "interfaith meetings," and "persons of different faiths," or of emphasizing "unity-in-diversity," when Catholics are describing their relations and attitude toward non-Catholics?

Question 2: When Pope Pius XII referred to "the right to worship God" in his Christmas message of 1942 as a fundamental human right, did he mean that everyone has a true right to practice whatever religion he deems true?

Answer 1: The use by Catholics of such expressions as "interfaith meetings" and "persons of different faiths," whereby non-Catholics are said or implied to have a different *faith* from Catholics is very unfortunate. The word *faith*, as traditionally used in the Catholic Church, signifies exclusively the one true faith, which is found only in the Catholic Church. Objectively, the faith is the body of truths that are proposed by the infallible magisterium of the Church as divinely revealed; subjectively, faith is the infused virtue whereby one accepts the truths of divine revelation on account of God's authority. It is true, the virtue of faith can reside in persons of good will separated from Catholic unity; yet, even in such the infused virtue impels them to believe only what is actually true; it does not extend to doctrines which they themselves may sincerely believe but which are actually false (St. Thomas, *Sum. theol.*, II-II, q. 1, a. 3). The words of St. Paul are very explicit in this connection: "One Lord, *one faith*, one baptism" (*Ephes.* 4:5). When Catholics wish to speak of those outside the true fold, they could refer to them as persons of different denominations, different beliefs, different creeds—but the word *faith* should be retained in its traditional Catholic sense.

Similarly, to characterize the relation between Catholics and Protestants as "unity-in-diversity" is misleading, inasmuch as it implies that essentially Catholics are one with heretics, and that their diversities are only accidental. Actually, the very opposite is the true situation. For, however near an heretical sect may seem to be to the Catholic Church in its particular beliefs, a wide

gulf separates them, inasfar as the divinely established means whereby the message of God is to be communicated to souls—the infallible magisterium of the Church—is rejected by every heretical sect. By telling Protestants that they are one with us in certain beliefs, in such wise as to give the impression that we regard this unity as the predominant feature of our relation with them, we are actually misleading them regarding the true attitude of the Catholic Church toward those who do not acknowledge her teaching authority.

Answer 2: In his Christmas message of 1942, Pope Pius XII enumerated among the basic human rights, called for by the dignity of the human person, "the right to religious formation and education; the right to the worship of God in private and in public" (*Principles of Peace*, n. 1846). Now, although the Soverign Pontiff did not further qualify the significance of "religious" and "worship," these words can refer only to the Catholic religion and worship, if the word "right" be taken in its proper, objective sense. For, if there is anything basic in Catholic teaching, it is the doctrine that the Son of God established only one religion and imposed on all men the obligation of embracing it; consequently, no other religion has a real objective right to exist and to function, and no individual has an objective right to embrace any non-Catholic religion. For certainly, no one has a right to act against the command of God. Such has ever been the teaching of the Church. For example, Pope Pius IX condemned the proposition "Everyone is free to embrace and to profess that religion which under the guidance of the light of human reason he has judged to be true" (*DB*, 1715).

It is true that a person may be justified in conscience when he practises a false religion; he may even be bound to embrace such a religion because of an invincibly erroneous conscience. But even in such a supposition, he has no real right to act as he does. In the words of Merkelbach: "As regards an invincibly erroneous conscience, although a man can and must follow it in the internal forum, he has no true and proper right to do so—a right which is founded on the objective relations of things—but only a supposed right (*jus existimatum*)" (*Summa theologiae moralis* [Paris, 1938], I, n. 211). Again, a person may have a *civil* right to practise a false religion, and to grant such liberty may be the most feasible policy even in a Catholic country. As Pope Leo XIII expressed

it: "If the Church judges that it is not lawful for various types of divine worship to have the same right as the true Church, she does not on that account condemn those rulers who, for the sake of gaining some good or prohibiting some evil, patiently tolerate in their conduct and practice that each have a place in the state" (*DB*, 1874). But, it must be emphasized, such a *civil right* by no means indicates that false religions have a *natural right* to exist, or that their members have a *natural right* to practise them.

It is to be hoped that Catholic priests will be scrupulously exact in explaining the doctrine of "freedom of worship," as the Catholic Church understands it, especially in these times when so many regard religion as a purely subjective affair, instead of a divinely established form of doctrine and worship, committed by the Son of God to His one true Church.

SURGERY FOR THE HEALTHY

Question: If a person is about to go to a foreign land where medical and hospital care is very difficult to obtain (e.g., a foreign missionary), may he have his appendix removed, even though he has no symptoms of appendicitis, on the score that an attack of this disease in his future abode, where the proper surgical treatment will not be available, will very probably be fatal?

Answer: According to Catholic moral principles, the mutilation or excision of a part of the body is permitted only when there is certainty or probability that benefit will thereby come to the whole body in sufficient measure to compensate for the harm that has been done. (It might be well to note in passing—though it does not relate to the question at hand—that this principle may be extended to include benefit to the body of another person. This interpretation is defended by the Rev. B. J. Cunningham, C.M., S.T.D., in *The Morality of Organic Transplanation* [Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1944]). If, however, there is not at least a probability that the mutilation or excision is necessary or useful, it is forbidden by the fifth commandment. Accordingly, the question with which we are concerned can be reduced to this: "Is it sufficiently probable that an operation for appendicitis will be necessary or useful at

some future time to justify such an operation at present on a person who indicates no symptoms of this ailment?"

Doubtless there are theologians who would deny that sufficient probability exists in the case of a healthy person, and who would consequently hold that such an operation is illicit. However, after discussing the matter with competent medical authorities, I have come to the conclusion that there is an argument in favor of the lawfulness of appendectomy on a well person, at least in the circumstances proposed by the questioner. For it seems that about twenty per cent of the people of America at the present day require an operation for appendicitis at some time in the course of their lives. Accordingly, if one can regard this proportion as establishing a sufficiently probable opinion that even a perfectly healthy individual will one day find it necessary to submit to this operation, he could admit the lawfulness of the operation here and now—at least if the individual is setting out for a place where good surgical treatment is not available. In view of the fact that there is grave danger of death if one is seized with appendicitis in the circumstances visualized, the probability based on the fact that one in five eventually contracts the disease would seem sufficient to justify the operation.

It should be noted that, although the prospect of contracting appendicitis is much less probable than the opposite in the case of a healthy person, an equiprobabilist, as well as a probabilist, could consistently follow the opinion just proposed, since serious danger to health or life is involved. In other words, the question must be viewed, not only from the standpoint of the lawfulness of a mutilating operation, but basically from the standpoint of the obligation to preserve one's health and life, and when this obligation is at stake, *per se* one must follow the safer side, so that even a much more probable opinion to the contrary (in our case the opinion that one will not contract appendicitis) may not be followed. (St. Alphonsus, *Theologia moralis*, I, 42 sq.). From this it would seem to follow that one would even be obliged to have the operation. However, various circumstances in this particular case would seem to render the operation in question an extraordinary means of safeguarding one's health. Now, there is no *obligation* of using an extraordinary means of protecting health and life; nevertheless, one is *permitted* to use such a means (St. Alphonsus, *Theologia moralis*, III, n. 372).

COALESCENCE OF THEFTS THROUGH INTENTION

Question: In classifying the various ways in which the amount taken in separate small thefts can coalesce into grave matter, theologians are accustomed to say that this can take place when one has the intention of ultimately stealing a large amount. On the other hand it is stated that widely separated small thefts do not render one guilty of mortal sin, provided a grave sum is not accumulated thereby. Will you kindly explain this apparent inconsistency?

Answer: Unfortunately some theologians express this mode of coalescence "through intention" ambiguously, to say the least. It is incorrect to state without qualification that the intention of ultimately stealing a large amount through separate small thefts is a mortal sin. Such an intention is a mortal sin only in either of two cases—first, when the person making the intention includes in it the purpose of retaining the stolen property—either actually, or equivalently in the form of purchased articles so that eventually he will have on hand a large amount of unjustly acquired goods, or, secondly, when he intends to commit petty thefts so close together in the order of time that they will be morally united into one act. It is more exact to describe this sin of "coalescence through intention" as the intention of gradually enriching oneself (*intentio paulatim ditescendi*), as St. Alphonsus expresses it (*Theologia moralis*, III, n. 533). In other words, since the thing intended is objectively a mortal sin, the intention of attaining it is a mortal sin.

On the other hand, the intention of stealing small amounts which would not coalesce either physically or morally would not be a mortal sin, even though eventually a large amount would have been stolen (abstracting from the case of one who would commit a mortal sin subjectively because of a false conscience), inasmuch as the intention of doing something that is not a mortal sin is not itself a mortal sin. In the words of Piscetta-Gennaro: "If from the beginning one has the intention of stealing grave matter, but through small thefts which do not coalesce (because they are separated by a great interval and the things which are stolen are consumed), he does not sin gravely. For the intention does not change the nature of things" (*Elementa theologiae moralis* [Turin, 1941], III, n. 257, *nota* 2).

Accordingly, if a clerk, employed by a large business firm, made the intention of stealing twenty dollars a year for the next ten years, and of spending each stolen amount as he took it, so that he would ultimately become no richer, he would be guilty, not of a mortal sin, but of ten venial sins of injustice in intention (according to the more approved method of numerically computing sins). It is similar to the case of a person who would make the intention of violating the law of abstinence venially every Friday for the ensuing year (e.g., by eating one ounce of meat each Friday). He would be guilty of fifty-two venial sins by that one act, not of a mortal sin, because the individual violations would not coalesce.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

THE DOUBLE RING CEREMONY AGAIN

Question: Within the past few years I have sometimes been asked by brides and bridegrooms, "May we have a double ring ceremony?" My answer has been that there is no mention in the Catholic Ritual of two rings and no ceremonies or words should be added which are not found in approved authors. Was I right?

Answer: We discussed the question of the double-ring ceremony for marriage in answer to a query published in the May issue of the *AER* for 1945. Our reply was in favor of granting the double-ring ceremony, when it is requested. This conclusion was based on a rubric of the Ritual itself (Tit. VII, Cap. iii, 6) which permits the retention of laudable customs in the celebration of the marriage rite, in addition to those contained in the Ritual.

THE INVESTITURE OF A DOMESTIC PRELATE

Question: Is there any official ceremony for the investiture of of a priest who has been appointed a Monsignore (Domestic Prelate)? If so, should the one officiating at the investiture be a bishop or may any priest act as officiant at the function?

Answer: There is a special form to be followed for the investiture of a Protonotary Apostolic and the ceremonial is found in a paper which accompanies the new prelate's brief of appointment. There is no such form prescribed for the Domestic Prelate. No

special ceremony of investiture need be held but it is quite proper to hold one. In the absence of any prescribed form, we suggest the following:

The officiant, who is usually, though not necessarily, a bishop, wears his choir dress rather than sacred vestments (cope and mitre) as the function is not a liturgical one. Hence the cappa magna or the mozzetta would be worn by the diocesan bishop, the mantelletta by an extern. The investing prelate may sit at the episcopal throne or on the faldstool before the altar. The master of ceremonies, or any priest, reads the brief of nomination in Latin and in the vernacular. The new Monsignore, clad in purple cassock and sash, is led to the officiant, before whom he kneels to receive the rochet, mantelletta, and biretta. As he clothes the new prelate with these insignia, the bishop may recite a form similar to the following: "Induo te rocheto et manteleto et capiti tuo biretum praelatitium impono ut scias te inter Summi Pontificis antistites urbanos rite esse renunciatum, cum juribus ac privilegiis huic dignitati annexis. Demum ad osculum pacis te recipio ac fraterna caritate te amplector. Adprecor Dominum ut omnia felicia faustaque sint tibi semper."

The newly invested prelate rises, receives the *Pax* from the bishop and standing kisses the ring of the latter. It seems better to have the insignia blessed beforehand with the *Benedictio ad omnia*, since the Ritual provides no special blessing for them.

This ceremony may take place at any time but, more becomingly, it seems to us, immediately before Mass, at which the new prelate would assist in his prelatial dress, observing the prescriptions of the ceremonial concerning standing, instead of kneeling, during the opening prayers at the foot of the altar and at the blessing.

If it is desirable to lengthen the ceremony, before his investiture, i.e., after the reading of the brief of nomination, the Monsignore may kneel before the altar and read the Profession of Faith, as is done in the official form for the investiture of Protonotaries Apostolic (cf. Schulte, *Benedicenda* (New York, 1907) pp. 310f.; Nabuco, *Pontificalis Romani expositio* (Petropoli, Brazil, 1945), III, Appendix, iii).

WHITE GOLD FOR SACRED VESSELS

Question: Since the inside of the cup of a chalice has to be plated in gold, is it permissible to have it done in white gold, or is white gold too much of an alloy? The reason for this query is that I am having a chalice made in silver and a white gold finish of the inside of the cup would harmonize better with the silver of which the whole vessel is made.

Answer: The reply to the above question depends upon whether or not white gold is real gold, since the etiquette governing the Blessed Sacrament requires that the Sacred Species come in immediate contact with only gold or linen. We have been informed that white gold contains seventy-five to eighty-five per cent pure gold and varying percentages of nickel and zinc. No gold objects, which are intended for any kind of wear, are entirely of the precious metal itself, which must be alloyed with baser metals to give the necessary durability. White gold has actually more gold in it than gold of low carat, for example, fourteen carat gold. Gold, which is eighteen carat fine is only three-quarters pure gold. We should conclude, therefore, that the high percentage of the required metal for sacred vessels contained in white gold qualifies it for use in the manufacture of those vessels, or parts of vessels, which liturgical law prescribes should be made of gold.

INTONING THE *PANGE LINGUA* AT PROCESSIONS

Question: It is the custom in some dioceses for the celebrant, while holding the ostensorium with the Blessed Sacrament, to intone the *Pange lingua* at the beginning of processions on the occasion of the Forty Hours' Devotion and on Corpus Christi. Is there any authority for this practice which seems to me incongruous?

Answer: The official liturgical books presume that there are chanters to intone the *Pange lingua* at the beginning of processions with the Blessed Sacrament. The Ritual indeed (Tit. IX, Cap. 5) does present a choice between the attending clergy and the officiating priest as intoners of the *Pange lingua* at the procession on Corpus Christi. The *Caeremoniale episcoporum* speaks only of the singers as beginning the hymn on that occasion (Lib. II, Cap. xxxiii, 20). The *Instructio Clementina* (XIX) mentions only the chanters for beginning the *Pange lingua* at the proces-

sions of exposition and reposition in connection with the Forty Hours' Devotion. The *Memoriale rituum*, giving instructions for the processions of the Blessed Sacrament in minor churches on Holy Thursday and Good Friday has the celebrant intone the *Pange lingua* and the *Vexilla regis* only when there are no singers to do so. The so-called Baltimore Ceremonial says nothing of intoning by the celebrant, but only by chanters, of the processional hymn on Corpus Christi. We conclude, therefore, that only in the absence of chanters who can manage it should the celebrant sing the opening line of the *Pange lingua* at the beginning of processions with the Blessed Sacrament, including those of Holy Week, Corpus Christi, and the Forty Hours' Devotion.

HOW THE ACOLYTES SHOULD HOLD THEIR CANDLES

Question: Is there any explicit rubric which says that the acolytes are to carry their candles directly in front of their faces? General practice seems to encourage this method but it certainly looks odd.

Answer: There is no *rubric* prescribing that the acolytes carry their candles either directly parallel to their noses or perpendicular to the right and left shoulders. The Missal (*Ritus serv.* II, 5) contents itself with saying merely that these ministers carry candles at Solemn Mass. The *Ceremoniale episcoporum* (Lib. I, xi, 8), going into greater detail, directs that the acolyte on the right place his right hand at the knob of the candlestick and his left hand at its foot while his companion keeps the left hand on the knob and the right hand at the foot of the candlestick. Martinucci (Lib. I, Cap. VIII, 7) adds that the candlestick is to be held perpendicularly in front of the chest. This is the Roman custom and that which our correspondent recognizes as the general practice. No rubric is violated, however, by carrying the candles toward the side, the right side for the first acolyte and the left side for the second, both in the longitude of the shoulders. This represents the French tradition.

SUPPRESSION OF THE USE OF SALIVA IN ADULT BAPTISM

Question: In the rite of infant Baptism, the rubric, concerning the touching of the ears and nose with saliva has been amended

to read: "This is omitted as often as there exists a reasonable cause of safeguarding cleanliness or when there is danger of contracting or communicating a disease" (S. R. C. Jan. 14, 1944). Is it reasonable to presume that under the same conditions the new rubric would apply also in the case of adults?

Answer: The questioner evidently has in mind the case where the long form for the Baptism of adults is used. There can be no difficulty when the form for infants is used in the Baptism of adults, as is customary in this country. Although the decree of the Sacred Congregation amends only the rubric in the ceremony of baptizing infants and says nothing about the form for adult Baptism, we think that the amendment also applies, *pari ratione*, to adults who are baptized according to the long form, as here also there is question of safeguarding cleanliness as well as of protecting from possible disease. The application of the saliva was a ceremony awkward to perform in a becoming manner and few will mourn its omission.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

SPONSORS AT BAPTISM

Question: Is it permissible in the case of the baptism of adults, or of children of grade school age who come from homes with poor Catholic background, to omit the sponsors and allow those baptized to answer for themselves?

Answer: Can. 762 provides expressly that no one is to be baptized solemnly, i.e. with the observance of all the rites and ceremonies found in the Ritual, unless he have his sponsor, in so far as possible. Even in the case of private baptism a sponsor is to be used, if he can easily be obtained; and if he was not a party to the actual baptism he is to be used in supplying the ceremonies, though in this latter case he does not contract the usual spiritual relationship with the newly baptised person. The logical conclusion, then, is that sponsors cannot be omitted in either of the cases mentioned above unless it is not possible to have them.

Because of the importance of the function which sponsors are called upon to perform it would seem that if it is physically possible to have them it would be necessary to have a serious and reasonable cause for not calling on those who are available. After

all, it is the sponsors who have the obligation, secondary to that of the parents, during the spiritual infancy of the newly baptised person, i.e. until this person is sufficiently instructed in the faith and in christian customs, to look after his christian upbringing in so far as they are able, so that he may show himself throughout his whole life to be such as he has promised in the solemn ceremony that he will be. The obligation of the sponsors is *per se* serious. Since the Church so regards it, it is clear that the reason for omitting them must be serious.

Even though the candidate for baptism be adult and well instructed prior to baptism, this will not necessarily make it easier for that person after baptism to live up to the promises there made. The sponsor it is who will help that person during the period after baptism to grow stronger in the faith and in the practice of the Christian religion. The mere fact, then, that the candidate for baptism is adult is hardly sufficient reason to omit the sponsor mentioned in the law.

Where the candidate for baptism is a child of school age, and even more so when of grade-school age, a sponsor is yet more necessary. If, in addition, the child comes from a home where the faith is not being practiced, so that those who normally should take care of the child's development in the faith and in Christian living will not do it, it becomes very necessary that sponsors assume the obligation of caring for the spiritual growth of the child newly baptised. In this latter case it will be practically impossible for the sponsors to presume that the parents will fulfill the duty, as they might were the parents practical Catholics. To omit, therefore, sponsors in this case would be to jeopardize seriously the faith of the newly baptized children.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

THE CHURCH AND HUMAN ACTIVITY

Those who accuse the Gospel and the Church of opposition to the natural expansion of human energy are slanderers. The Gospel and the Church, far from censuring activity, respect it; and because they respect it they withdraw it from the dangers of disorder, thereby protecting right order in man and in society.

—Cardinal Mercier, in the *Conferences Delivered to His Seminarists at Mechlin* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1943), p. 177.

Analecta

The recently received copy of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* reports the secret consistory[1] and the semi-public consistory[2] of June 13, 1946. In the former our Holy Father announced the appointments of Thomas Cardinal Tien to the newly established Archdiocese of Peking and of Paul Yu-pin to the newly established Archdiocese of Nanking; among the bishops, the appointments of Cuthbert O'Gara to the newly established Diocese of Yuanling, Francis X. Ford to the newly established Diocese of Kaying, Edward Galvin to the newly established Diocese of Hanyang, and the late John R. Hagan, as auxiliary of the Bishop of Cleveland.

In the semi-public consistory our Holy Father referred to the secret and public consistories in which the canonization of Mother Frances Xavier Cabrini had been dealt with and asked for the votes of the Cardinals in reference to it, which resulted in unanimous approval. At the same time they voted similarly on the canonization of Blessed John de Britto, martyr, Blessed Bernard Realino, confessor, and Blessed Jeanne Elizabeth Bichier des Ages, virgin.

By an Apostolic Constitution of June 23, 1945,[3] our Holy Father permitted the establishment of a chapter of canons in the cathedral of the Diocese of Amos, Canada. The chapter consists of nine canons and one dignity; appointment to the latter is reserved to the Holy See. The canons are dispensed from residence at the cathedral and from choir duty except on the feast of the Patroness of the cathedral, St. Teresa, and on the solemnity of St. Joseph.

Two letters of congratulation issued by our Holy Father are reported in the present number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis:* one, dated March 21, 1946,[4] addressed to the Prior General of the Camaldolese, to mark the centenary of the death of Pope Gregory XVI; the other, dated May 12, 1946,[5] addressed to the Prefect General of the Order of Clerks Regular Ministering to the Sick, to mark the second centenary of the canonization of the Founder of the Order, St. Camillus de Lellis.

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXVIII (1946), 237

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 246. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 247. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 250. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 251.

Two allocutions of our Holy Father are addressed to the representatives of Ireland and Portugal at the Holy See; the former dated June 12, 1946;[6] the latter, June 8, 1946.[7] The faith of the people of both nations was extolled, as well as the great hope reposed in them for the part they shall play in the reconstruction of the world on the basis of sound morality. The occasion for both allocutions was the presentation of the credentials of the representatives. Both allocutions end with the Apostolic Blessing. Similar sentiments are expressed in the radio message which our Holy Father sent on May 13, 1946,[8] to the faithful of Portugal on the occasion of the crowning of Our Lady of Fatima with a gold crown in the name of our Holy Father.

On June 1, 1946,[9] the feast of our Holy Father's Patron, Pope St. Eugene I, our Holy Father delivered an allocution to the Cardinals on the occasion of their tender of congratulations. He lamented the disappointment of hopes for peace raised at the cessation of hostilities and accentuated the fact that the restoration of the Christian brotherhood of man lay as a heavy responsibility on the Church. The Church will be capable of it, he insisted, and only courage is required, a courage that will be stimulated by reference to the renewed vigor with which the Church has surmounted the obstacles, even the persecution, of the recent past. The role of the Church as the protectress of true liberty he placed vividly before the electorate of two nations which, at that time, was confronted by a choice between human liberty and State absolutism. He exhorted the nations to find some way of expediting the return of prisoners and the expatriated. The long delay in bringing the war to an end should not be used, he said, as pretext for keeping prisoners away from their homes and families. The allocution ended with a plea that the Month of the Sacred Heart be seized as an opportunity for expiation, especially the Feast of the Sacred Heart. The Apostolic Blessing was then imparted to the Cardinals and to all united with them on that occasion in thought and sentiment.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[6] *Ibid.*, p 262.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 260.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 264.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 253.

Book Reviews

DANTE ALIGHIERI. By Gerald G. Walsh, S.J. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1946. Pp. viii + 183. $3.00.

The sub-title of this work is "Citizen of Christendom." Here is a presentation of the great Italian poet as a well-rounded man whose life span embraced the transition from the age of reason to the age of revolt. Based on the series of Lowell lectures delivered by the author in the Boston Public Library during November and December, 1945, the book shows us a man who had realized that to be whole, complete, a man must develop both head and heart, preserving all the while that balance between them which is true sanity.

Dante's ideal of supremacy of love based on a rule of reason might well be adopted in this day when men seek to unite the nations into one world, a hopeless task until we have first found a way to unite the individuals themselves into whole men.

From this development of the man himself came the ideas which he set forth as a solution for the chaos of his own time. Rome, the Christian capital, was for him the capital of the world, the center of a single society bound together for a common purpose and built on principles and values which were good for all men.

Unity in the world could only come if men had a common purpose, common ideas, and common aspirations, he felt. More than contiguity of geography he valued continuity of history, a oneness with the past and future of mankind. The authority in this united world would have to be he felt, under the influence of the democratic systems of the Italian cities of his time, democratic, based on consent of the governed, but sufficiently strong to keep the world from being divided against itself and laid waste.

For those who are unable to read this great author in the smooth verses of the original tongue, Fr. Walsh has done a great service in making his ideas available. To those who can read the original language, Fr. Walsh's interpretations will give added enjoyment.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

THE MYSTERIES OF CHRISTIANITY. By M. J. Scheeben. Translated by Cyril Vollert, S.J. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1946. Pp. 834. $7.50.

The author, the subject, and the number of pages in the book are ample indication that no ordinary review can furnish a full critique of it. Each one of its ten parts (The Trinity; God in the Original Creation;

Sin; The God-man; The Eucharist; The Church and the Sacraments; Christian Justification; Glorification and the Last Things; Predestination; The Science of the Mysteries of Christianity) offers more than enough material for a full article of review and critique. In addition, the purpose of the book is synthetic so that a wide range of relationships is covered under each heading. If, at the same time, it is remembered how extensive is Scheeben's patristic and theological learning, how facilely he employs it, and how original are his theological insights, then the task of compressing a full appreciation of this work into a review becomes somewhat dismaying. The only possible solution seems to be a presentation of his purpose together with a description of some of the highlights of the book and a general evaluation of the whole.

The basis of the work, as its title implies, is the importance and place of the Christian mysteries. Scheeben contends, and rightly so, that it is the revealed mysteries that specify Christianity and distinguish it from every other religious system. Since theology finds its proper domain in these very mysteries then they form a distinct category and call for a full synthesis of their own. His approach to this synthesis is on the plane of their supernatural character. In fact it would appear no distortion of his thought to say that his approach to each mystery is from the point of view of grace, created and uncreated. Lest this description of his method give the idea that the work is speculatively remote, it should also be noted that it is in no sense an esoteric affair. Neither does the work have anything in common with so many theological books which give the impression of a body with the bones on the outside of the flesh. On the contrary, its pages glow with a warm richness that bespeaks deep learning, apostolic enthusiasm, and an abiding conviction that Catholic dogma is a living structure formed by the Holy Spirit. With regard to the individual sections his pages on "The Significance of the Mystery of the Trinity" are especially illuminating. He shows the life of the Trinity as the "root of the order of grace" and in terms of this enlarges on its place in the life of grace in men. Grace gives us power to know and love God as God knows and loves Himself and this knowledge and love terminate in the Divine Persons. Scheeben takes this fundamental concept and uses it to bring to the surface rich veins of theological ore that can be mined with profit by the educated Catholic whether theologian or not.

In connection with this Trinitarian teaching his much discussed opinion on the indwelling of the Holy Spirit comes to the fore. What is clear here is that his theory is not to be linked with that of Petavius. The French writer had held that this union with the Holy Spirit is an exclusively proper one, a clearly untenable theory. Scheeben, however, is dealing with the order of our relation to the justifying work of the

Trinity, and he puts our relation to the Holy Spirit first by priority of reason and nature. So while the reasoning behind Scheeben's theory has many debatable points and involves some very tenuous distinctions between created and uncreated grace, still it offers much that is helpful and is not to be discarded casually by lumping it together with those of Petavius and Passaglia. For a fuller study of this point the reader is referred to an excellent article, "The Indwelling of the Holy Spirit According to M. J. Scheeben" by Fr. Malachi Donnelly, S.J., in *Theological Studies,* VII, 2 (June 1946), 244-80.

Another section that will be of value to retreat masters and to those obligated to give conferences to religious is the one that treats of "The Mystery of Sin." In accord with his basic approach, sin is viewed from the standpoint of habitual grace. Thus he defines habitual sin as "culpable unholiness"—a striking and illuminating phrase—and sees the proper character of sin as "the extinction of sanctity." The reasoning behind this offers a wealth of material for conveying in a positive way the malice of sin and the destruction it wreaks upon the Christian life.

A synthetic treatment of this kind necessarily precludes a detailed exposition of the arguments which the teaching presupposes, especially where the argumentation has been presented in detail elsewhere as is the case with Scheeben. Despite this a number of points remain debatable in themselves. Among these may be mentioned: (1) His contention that the narrative of *Genesis* makes no explicit mention of the supernatural gifts bestowed on Adam. (2) The apparent exclusion of the theological explanation that original justice was a specific perfection (that is, ordained for the species of which Adam's nature was the source). (3) The lack of clarity with regard to the term "imputation." His usage of it to explain our part in Adam's sin seems to restrict too much the notion of *voluntarium* which, as the condemnation of Baius evidences, belongs to the *ratio* and *definitio peccati* (cf. *D.B.* 1046, 1047). (4) His condemnation of the scholastic teaching that sacramental character is imprinted in the faculties of the soul. It seems here that he has failed to grasp the full significance of the Thomist concept of *potentia.* (5) Exception might well be taken to his employment of Suarez' theory of transsubstantiation to explain the sacrificial act in the Mass, particularly in view of his presentation of the nature of the sacramental order. (6) His explanation of what he terms "the reasoned probability of theological principles." He does not appear to take into full account the principle of sufficient reason and the part that it plays in the production of certitude. Perhaps though, many of these things would have been further clarified had he lived to see the full restoration of Thomism which came after his time.

By way of a general evaluation, this book is without doubt a modern

theological classic. Its synthetic power, breadth of view, and depth of insight into the great Christian mysteries remove it from the class of a mere space-filler on the theology teacher's bookshelf and assigns to it a habitual place on his desk as one of his tools. It is not to be read while he runs but kept constantly open so as to give him unfailing help in clothing the skeletal structure of the handbook with flesh, beauty and power.

This book, however, is not restricted to technical theology. Any priest interested in dogma, or looking for material for convert lectures and instructions, or concerned with teaching theology to the laity will find inspiration, knowledge, and understanding here in abundance. Then, too, many an educated Catholic layman who has found such works as Fr. Farrell's *Companion to the Summa* bringing him to an adult understanding of his faith will find *The Mysteries of Christianity* complementing them and enlarging the horizon which they have made known.

EUGENE M. BURKE, C.S.P.

LIGHT FROM THE ANCIENT PAST. The Archeological Background of the Hebrew-Christian Religion. By Jack Finegan. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1946. Pp. xxxiv + 500. $5.00.

This book, which has received high praise from such an authority as Professor Albright, has been hailed in the Protestant theological press as the book of the year. It should not be unknown to busy priests who are interested in possessing and giving to others an outline picture of the history of mankind and of religion.

Here is brought together in a form intelligible to the ordinary reader much of the fruit of decades of plodding research. The story begins in Mesopotamia about 5000 B. C. and Mesopotamian culture is followed down through the Old Babylonian period. The author then takes his readers to Egypt and unrolls before them the panorama of life and culture in the land of the Pharaohs. Next the data on Palestine from the Stone Age to the Late Iron Age is rehearsed. Then the high spots of the history of the empires of Western Asia are touched upon. The following chapters deal briefly with the Holy Land in the time of Our Lord and with the journeys of St. Paul. There follow interesting discussions of the mechanics of writing in ancient times, the discovery in recent times of ancient papyri, and some timely information on the text of St. Paul's epistles. Chapters on the Catacombs and Ancient Churches have been added.

Mr. Finegan, who is a minister of the Disciples of Christ and director of religious activities at Iowa State College, writes in an attractive

style and has a flair for the interesting. Moreover he has done research work of his own in addition to reading widely in the publications which report on archaeological investigations. In addition Mr. Finegan has kept his theological convictions in the background and has let the monuments and documents speak for themselves. Since he was the pupil of Hans Lietzmann we would expect more Liberal Protestantism to appear than does. The little that has come to the surface is, for the most part, a quite chastened liberalism.

For a book which abounds in names and dates, this one is remarkably free of slips and errors although of course some are to be found. Looked at however from the viewpoint of strict scholarship the work necessarily suffers by comparison with its sources. A case of superficiality could perhaps be made out against it. But when we bear in mind what Mr. Finegan wanted to do, we cannot but be grateful to him for a fine production.

E. A. RYAN, S.J.

MISSION FOR SAMARITANS. By Anna Dengel, M.D. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1946. Pp. x + 126. $1.75.

The Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries was founded in 1925 by Dr. Anna Dengel for the purpose of serving the cause of neighborly love. Made up mostly of women physicians and trained nurses, this religious society has devoted its efforts to systematic care, cure, and prevention of disease among pagan people with the aim of healing bodies in order to win souls.

The present volume by the foundress of the Society outlines briefly and clearly what medical mission work is, what it has done, and what it plans to do. The larger portion of the work consists of a world survey of health conditions in the medical mission fields of Africa, India, China, the islands of the Pacific, and Latin America, as well as among the Indians, Eskimos, Negroes, and underprivileged whites in America. This survey is an interesting and impressive world-tour which gives a close-up of the wretched conditions that cry out for medical mission labors. Due credit is given to the Protestant pioneers in the mission fields who set up medical colleges, hospitals, and dispensaries.

The reading of this book should prove a challenge to the religious efforts of Catholic girls charged with the duty of caring for the sick. Medical mission work calls for heroic charity. It is the vocation of the Catholic girl of unselfish love who is willing to give her best to God and humanity.

FRANK P. CASSIDY

Book Notes

A lady who belongs to the faculty of letters and philosophy in the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Milan, Italy, has published a competent and valuable theological study. The book is *La libertà nell'atto di fede* (Milano: Società Editrice "Vita e Pensiero," 1945), pp. 76. In this book, Maria Eugenia dal Verme gives a detailed and competent analysis of St. Thomas' position, compares it with the doctrines of Cajetan, De Lugo, Bannez, Suarez, and John of St. Thomas, and then brings out the teachings of a representative number of modern apologists on the liberty of the act of faith. She accepts the teaching of Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange as the most accurate explanation of the problem.

Incidentally, the twenty-first day of this month will be Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange's seventieth birthday. Probably the most revered theologian living today, the great Dominican professor of the Angelico has exercised a unique influence in the Catholic intellectual life of our century. According to the special issue of *Angelicum* published ten years ago to honor his sixtieth birthday, his first published writing appeared in the *Revue Thomiste* in 1904. Ten years ago his bibliography listed 280 different writings, including eleven books. The following year he began the publication of his commentary on the *Summa* by issuing his *De Deo Uno*. Since then, during the war years, three more volumes of the commentary have appeared, *De Deo Trino et Creatore*, *De Eucharistia*, and *De Christo Salvatore*. Then too, by his recent work, *De sanctificatione sacerdotum secundum nostri temporis exigentias*, he has contributed to the recent literature on priestly spirituality.

His first book, *Le sens commun*, appeared in 1909 as one of the great theological attacks on the modernist position. He contributed mightily to the science of fundamental dogmatic theology by the publication of his *De revelatione* in 1918 and to the treatise on the unity of God through the publication, in 1915, of his *Dieu, Son existence et sa nature*. These two were by all means the most famous and the most influential of his works. A great portion of his writing, however, during the latter portion of his life, has been in the field of spiritual theology. Best known of these works is his *Perfection chrétienne et contemplation* (1923), although the now out-of-print *L'amour de Dieu et la Croix de Jésus* (1929), is sometimes considered his best. In 1938 he published the first of the two volumes of his treatise on ascetical and mystical theology, his *Les trois âges de la vie intérieure*.

Fr. Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange had as his associates and friends in the Roman schools of theology some of the most glorious figures in recent Catholic history. He belonged in the group that included such men as Billot and Hugon and De la Taille. Of this magnificent company, only he remains. On this, his seventieth birthday, his brother priests throughout the world will pray that God may spare him to us for many years to come.

Regretfully *The American Ecclesiastical Review* announces the death, in Scotland last December, of the distinguished Scriptural scholar, Fr. Hugh Pope, O.P. He was seventy-seven years old when he died. Readers in this *Review* will remember his article "What are the 'Apocrypha'?" in the March, 1946, issue. May he rest in peace!

English translations of two well known books of meditations for priests have recently appeared in this country. The two books, both published by the Frederick Pustet Company, of New York and Cincinnati are *Priestly Zeal for Souls*, from the German of Rev. John J. Janssen, S.V.D., in an English ver-